

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO LII. JULY 1888.

ART. I.—THE PRINTED EDITIONS OF THE  
SYRIAC NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *An Account of a Syriac Biblical Manuscript of the Fifth Century, with special Reference to its Bearing on the Text of the Syriac Version of the Gospels* (Studia Biblica, pp. 151-174). By the Rev. G. H. GWILLIAM. (Oxford, 1885.)
2. ܡܬܬܝܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܬܬܝܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܬܬܝܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ [The New Testament in Syriac]. (New York, 1886.)

THE history of the printed editions of the Syriac New Testament indicates a rapid growth, followed by an early decline, of interest among Biblical scholars in a version which is on many grounds worthy of no common esteem. It was not till the fifth year of the latter half of the sixteenth century that the Syriac text (commonly known as the Peshitto) of the New Testament was first issued from the press at Vienna ; but so strongly was its importance felt by the theologians of that day, reformed and unreformed alike, that seven editions of it had appeared before the close of the year 1600, one of them forming part of the Antwerp Polyglot, or *Biblia Regia*. The seventeenth century added five more, but of these only three were separate issues, the other two being the texts contained (together with that of the Old Testament) in the great Paris Polyglot, and in its better-known successor of London. Accordingly, when Schaaf in 1709 published his excellent edition, he reckoned it the thirteenth ; but the eighteenth century, in its remaining ninety years, seems to have done little towards multiplying copies, and as little towards settling the text, of the venerable version which, in the earlier years of its appearance on the field of Biblical literature, had given so much employment to the scholars and the printing-presses of Europe.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. LII.

S

Of the thirteen editions we have indicated (an enumeration not complete, but sufficient for our present purpose) England can claim but one—a famous one, no doubt, yet one whose high place in the esteem of Biblical students is due rather to the celebrity of the vast work of which it is a part, than to any special merit ascribable to it as regards its text, which indeed is in the main a mere reprint of its Parisian precursor. It dates from the middle of the seventeenth century; and, though in the closing years of the eighteenth Oxford sent forth from the Clarendon Press the first (which is still the only) edition of the later Syriac New Testament translation, known as the Harkleian (or more commonly, though inaccurately, as the Philoxenian), it is not a little remarkable that no separate English edition of the Peshitto New Testament appeared until more than a century and a half after Walton's Polyglot. The company of Oriental scholars whom Walton gathered round him for that great undertaking—Thorndike, Pocock, Castel—and the Dutch and German fellow-workers in the same field who encouraged and advised them in their labours—De Dieu, L'Empereur, Gerard Voss, Boate—these were men whose learning and zeal in Oriental sacred literature adorn the records of the seventeenth century. Above them all stands the figure of the illustrious Ussher, the inspiring genius of the work whose inception was due to his originating impulse as its successful prosecution was largely aided by his learning and munificence—the man whose generous largeness of spirit was a power to draw all who loved Biblical studies, at home or abroad, into harmonious co-operation. On the Continent, in the following century, the pursuit of Syriac learning was adequately kept up by such scholars as Eichhorn, Storr, de Rossi, Bruns, Norberg, Middeldorpf, Bugati, Adler, and J. D. Michaelis; but against these the England of that period has to show but the names of the two men who gave to the world the Harkleian version—Ridley and White.

But since the beginning of the present century the balance has shifted. Within its first quarter, the British and Foreign Bible Society had sent forth a handsome edition of the New Testament in Syriac (1816), speedily followed by a second (of the whole Bible in smaller type, 1826), and a third for Nestorian use (1829). To these, not many years later, the well-known Polyglot series of Mr. Bagster contributed another New Testament—in clearness and elegance of typography (though hardly in accuracy) superior, in our judgment, to nearly all its predecessors. All these, we believe, are now out of print. In



1841 the American Bible Society, from its mission printing-press at Urumiah in Persia, produced an edition of the whole Syriac Bible, since reprinted at New York in 1874, which may fairly claim to be reckoned at least equal to those of the sister society of England. Here was a new and unlooked-for departure—the Syriac Scriptures edited and printed by the enterprise and learning of America for Asiatic use and in the heart of Asia: a fact of hopeful promise, showing that the zeal for Syriac Biblical learning, as it had more than two hundred years ago crossed the Channel to England, so in these latter days it has crossed the Atlantic too, and lives and works among the sons of England's 'gigantic Daughter of the West.'

And now we welcome the beautiful Syriac New Testament (with the Psalter subjoined), given to the world under the same auspices, and published at New York, whose title we have prefixed to this article. It is a marvel of delicately finished execution and of cheapness. Though very small (six inches by four), it is quite as easily read as any of the larger editions, owing to the clear-cut distinctness of the type employed, and the ample spacing of the lines, by which full room is allowed for the vowels. These are uniformly denoted, in the peculiarly Syrian method, by a system of points, to the exclusion of the Greek vowel-characters, which many MSS. and most European editions use indiscriminately with the Syrian punctuation proper.<sup>1</sup> This mode of vocalization, and the Nestorian form of the character used, in this as in the former American editions, may at first repel a student whose eye is used to the more familiar vowel forms, and to the common cursive type of the Syriac alphabet, usually called Maronite. But we believe it will be found on trial that the American editors, in consulting the interests of their Eastern missions by adopting the Nestorian character, have conferred on Syriac scholars the boon of a Syriac New Testament and Psalter more readily legible and less trying to the sight, as well as more portable, than even the hitherto unsurpassed edition of Mr. Bagster.

The summary we have given above of the existing editions of the Syriac Bible, though we have not aimed at drawing up an exhaustive list—and in particular have forborne to inquire what additions have been made to them by the presses of the Continent of Europe in more recent times—will suffice to

<sup>1</sup> We observe that the editors, in the vocalization of the text, use forms akin to the Chaldee in preference to those laid down by grammarians as properly Syriac. These forms represent the traditionary Nestorian usage.

show that the Syriac student has a considerable range of choice, whether among the older editions, chiefly of Germany and the Low Countries (some of which may be procured with little difficulty), or the more recent and easily attainable ones of London and New York. Of the total number, however, not a few are mere reprints. For some editions additional MS. evidence has been called in—as, for example, that of Tremellius (1569), and those of Plantin of Antwerp—of all of which we shall have to speak presently. More recently, the British and Foreign Bible Society's editors (Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Lee) have collated three or four fresh MSS. for their issues.<sup>1</sup> Fresh MS. material is known to have been used also by Dr. Justus Perkins for the American editions. But to none of these has there been appended a digest of the MS. evidence on which the text rests; and the editions of the English and American Bible Societies do not even give such a collection of various readings as is to be found in Bagster's and many previous ones. Thus it is now three hundred and thirty-three years since the *Editio Princeps* was published; ten generations of scholars and printers have been revising or repeating its text: and a really critical edition of the Syriac New Testament, based on a sufficient collation of the best available MSS. and accompanied by an adequate *apparatus criticus*, exhibiting in full the MS. evidence in every case of variation of reading, is still a desideratum.

For such an edition the materials are forthcoming in rich abundance. Indeed, it was not for lack of such that the work was not begun many generations ago, as the Catalogues of the Vatican and of other great continental libraries attest. But now and here, in this nineteenth century and in England, the treasures of the Syrian Convent of the Deipara in the Nitrian Desert, transported as they have been almost bodily into the Manuscript Collection of the British Museum, have more than doubled in number, and far more than doubled in value, the available means for establishing on a scientific basis the text which hitherto has rested on the evidence—and that the imperfectly recorded evidence—of a few codices, some of them of no high antiquity. We need not repeat the often-told narrative of the acquisition by the trustees of the Museum, through the agency of Archdeacon Tattam, of those precious stores of long-hidden knowledge.<sup>2</sup> A glance over the pages of the

<sup>1</sup> We have not seen the edition of 1829, but we understand that it exhibits the text of an independent MS.

<sup>2</sup> See *Quarterly Review*, No. CLIII., December 1845; also Cureton's *Festal Letters of Athanasius*, Pref. pp. iv.-xv.

first volume of Dr. Wright's admirable *Catalogue of the Syrian MSS. in the British Museum* will show how vast is the accession of Biblical MSS. which have been rescued from the cellars in which the monks of Scete were content for centuries to leave them to rot, and have been made accessible to the Biblical students of England and of the world at large. It is high time that the learning and industry of the country which possesses so great a treasure should, before the close of the century whose earlier years witnessed their acquisition, produce, as the worthiest fruit of this precious possession, a text of the Peshitto New Testament, restored as closely as possible to that which the Syrian Church read in the fifth century or earlier—a text fit to take its place beside the best critical editions of the Greek original.

It is, therefore, with no common satisfaction that we learn that the University of Oxford has taken effectual steps to secure for itself the honour of giving to the world such an edition as we indicate, and that the revision of the text of the Gospels has been committed by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to the hands of a scholar so competent to the task as the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, Fellow of Hertford College. We congratulate the University on its enterprise, and on the good judgment which has guided the Delegates in their selection of an editor. The Essay whose title stands first at the head of this article is full of evidence of Mr. Gwilliam's critical judgment and accuracy, and at the same time gives us a foretaste of his results. We learn from it that 'the collation of ancient Syriac MSS. tends to confirm, in all important respects, the traditional text' (that, namely, in the main, of the *Editio Princeps*), and that the corrections to be made, though not few, 'for the most part will be in comparatively unimportant points of grammar and orthography.' The oldest of these MSS., it appears, carry us back farther than the revisions (or rather retranslations) of the Syriac Bible which are recorded as having been made in the seventh and sixth centuries: for some of them belong to the fifth, and are thus contemporary with two of the great Greek uncials, A and C, and presumably derive their text from MSS. at least as old as the yet older Greek codices B and  $\alpha$ . Yet this, the oldest attainable Syriac text, is substantially the same 'as the Syriac printed in 1555 and received since then; and it, on the whole, rather inclines to the type of text' known as the *Textus Receptus* of the Greek Testament, than to that which modern critics have endeavoured to reconstruct on the basis of the oldest Greek MS. evidence.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Studia Biblica*, pp. 167-169.

The interest and importance of these conclusions, as factors in the problem of approximation to the original text of the New Testament, we need not point out. Of the critical basis on which they rest we are enabled to form an estimate by a Prospectus issued (though not published) by the Delegates. It informs us that the MSS. of the Gospels already collated for the forthcoming work are twenty-three in number, of dates ranging from the fifth century to the eighth—the collation of twelve having been made by the late Mr. Philip Pusey,<sup>1</sup> and of the rest by Mr. Gwilliam himself or (in two instances) by the Rev. E. J. Perry, of Worcester College. The specimens of the work given in this prospectus are such as to show its scholarly thoroughness and its perfection of arrangement. The text is printed in the bold and compact type which is familiar to all who use the *Thesaurus Syriacus* of Dean Payne Smith—another noble undertaking, worthy of Oxford and its Press. We are not sure, however, that it is so pleasing to the eye or so easily legible as the Nestorian type of the New York editions, or the more ordinary form of character used in Bagster's, or (perhaps best of all) that of the Trübner Press of Leipzig, as, for example, in Bernstein's *St. John*. Indeed, for clearness and beauty of execution, no later edition has surpassed the *Editio Princeps*, though the fact that its text is not fully furnished with vowels excludes it from close comparison with its successors of the last two centuries and a half—all of which, from the Paris Polyglot down to the last, exhibit every word with all its vowels. The *Editio Princeps* was, however, a wonderful work for its time, and the history of its publication, and of the events that prepared the way for it, and of the persons concerned in it, is worth relating.

The first European scholar who appears to have had any knowledge of Syriac, and probably the first who possessed a copy of any part of the Scriptures in that tongue, was Teseo Ambrogio, one of the family of the Counts of Albonese in the Lomellina, who was born at Pavia in 1469. He began life as a lawyer, but afterwards was ordained priest, entered the community of the Canons of St. John Lateran, and became Provost of S. Pietro in Ciel d'Oro in his native city. When the fifth Lateran Council was sitting (1513-1515) the Maronite

<sup>1</sup> Of these the one marked 'Z' is one of the two Bodleian MSS. of which a collation was published at Oxford in 1805 by Richard Jones in his *Textus SS. Evangeliorum Versionis Simplicis Syriacæ collatus cum duobus ejusdem vetustis Codd. MSS.*, a work which deserves to be noticed as the first step made by an English scholar towards a critical text of the Peshitto.

Patriarch, Simeon, sent three of his clergy to represent him there—the Maronite Church having made its submission to the Roman See three centuries before, at the time of the fourth Lateran Council (1211), when the Patriarch, Jeremias II., visited Pope Innocent III. at Rome and was detained by him there for more than five years. One of these Maronites, the Priest Acurius Josephus, having requested permission to celebrate Mass in a Roman church after the Syriac Ritual and in the Syriac tongue, Teseo, who was then in Rome, was commissioned by the Cardinal Santa Croce to instruct him in Latin, to inquire into his orthodoxy, and to examine his Liturgy. Teseo was at this time barely acquainted with the elements of the Semitic tongues; and it was through the medium of a learned Jew that he accomplished his task of rendering into Latin the Syriac Liturgy, which one of the Syrians (Elias, a subdeacon) translated for him orally into his vernacular Arabic, the Jew acting as interpreter. Under the teaching of these Syrians he acquired a proficiency in their language, and was encouraged in the study of it by the then Pope, Leo X. After the death of this Pope (1521) he returned to his native Pavia, and there devoted himself to prepare for publication the Syriac Psalter with sundry *collectanea* concerning the Syriac and other little-known tongues. For this purpose he had provided copper matrices and had cast types, a printer was engaged, and all was ready, when a great calamity befel him. In 1527, while he was at Ravenna attending a chapter of his order, Pavia was taken by storm by the army of Francis I. of France, under Lautrec, and in the sack of the city all his possessions—books, papers, together with the types and other printing appliances—were pillaged or burnt. Two years after this disastrous check to his undertaking we find him retired to a monastery of Reggio (in Modena). In the autumn of 1529 the Emperor Charles V. rested in that city on his way from Genoa to Bologna, where he was to be crowned by Pope Clement VII. In his train was a young German, by name John Albert Widmanstadt, born about 1506, of humble parentage, in the village of Nellingen, near Ulm, who, though by training a lawyer, had, from his earliest years, been full of ardour for the study of Greek and of the Oriental tongues. While yet a boy, by his diligence in acquiring Greek, he had attracted the notice of Reuchlin (otherwise known after the pedantic fashion of the time as Capnio); his early preceptor, Jacob Jonas, had initiated him into Hebrew; and now, at the age of two or three and twenty, he was ambitious of widening the range of his linguistic attainments. The fame of Teseo's

Oriental learning had reached him, and induced him to take this opportunity of visiting him in his retreat. The old scholar observed with pleasure the eagerness with which the young one examined the contents of the monastic library, and it struck him that here was one to take up the study which he himself could hardly hope to live to pursue to any abiding result. He drew him aside into his private chamber and took down from his bookcase a copy of the Gospels in Syriac, obtained probably from his Maronite teachers—which (we may conclude) had been carried with him as a cherished companion to Ravenna and had thus escaped the fate which befel the books he had left at Pavia :

‘For fifteen years,’ he said, ‘I have given myself to the study of the Syriac tongue, and have had no rival in my devotion to it. My desire is now to find one to whom I may hand over this book in my old age—one who will undertake the acquisition of the language hallowed by the blessed lips of Christ Himself.’

Widmanstadt, with hearty alacrity, offered himself for the sacred trust, accepted the precious volume, and at once became the pupil of Ambrogio, who proceeded then and there to impart to him the rudiments of Syriac, and finally dismissed him with written memoranda to aid him in following up the study, and with the parting charge, ‘Give to the Church of Christ what I have given to you.’

Many years were to elapse, however, before this injunction of Ambrogio could be fulfilled, and he did not live to see its fulfilment, though he completed his full term of threescore and ten. He removed from Reggio to Ferrara, and in that strong city, then ruled by Duke Ercole II., felt himself sufficiently secure to renew his types and other apparatus, and to begin (in July 1537) the printing of his *Introductio in Chaldaicam Linguam*, &c., which he completed in his native Pavia, after he had returned thither in 1538 by command of the heads of his Order, and published it on March 1, 1539. This work is to be noticed here not merely because it exhibits the earliest specimens of (*inter alia*) Syriac printed from movable metal types, but because among these there are included the Lord’s Prayer, the Ave Maria, the Magnificat, the Parable of the Marriage Feast (Matt. xxii.), and a few other brief extracts from the Peshitto;<sup>1</sup> and to Teseo, therefore, belongs the

<sup>1</sup> The full title of this very rare work is *Introductio in Chaldaicam Linguam, Syriacam, atq; Armenicam et decem alias Linguas. Characterum Differentium Alphabeta circiter quadraginta*, &c. Besides the Syriac, the Armenian is printed from types proper, but the Samaritan, Coptic, and Arabic words are filled in with the pen, and many alphabets



honour of being the first to print any portion of that version. In 1534, before leaving Ferrara, he had the singular good fortune to recover, after seven years, his lost copy of the Syriac Psalter, which he accidentally lighted on in a sausage-maker's shop in that city, torn and disfigured, but complete. But he died in 1540 without having carried out his purpose of printing it.<sup>1</sup> The fate of his copy is unknown, and the Psalms in Syriac were not printed till 1610, by Erpenius, at Leiden.

But the Syriac Gospels fared better, and the result proved that the hands to which Ambrogio had committed them were worthy of the trust. Widmanstadt appears never to have lost

are annexed printed from large rude type—apparently cast from letters roughly cut in wood. At the end (f. 212 v<sup>o</sup>) is exhibited a facsimile of an autograph of the Devil; written (he tells us, ff. 195 r<sup>o</sup>, 198 v<sup>o</sup>, 200 r<sup>o</sup>, 212 v<sup>o</sup>) by an invisible hand in reply to a conjuration addressed to the demon Amon by a magician, in presence of many witnesses, from one of whom he obtained the document. It consists of seven lines, in characters mostly of bifurcate and trifurcate shape. He admits that he was unable and indeed not desirous to decipher it, and he relates his difficulties in finding a messenger to carry a letter in which it was enclosed, or an engraver to copy it. The magician to whom it was addressed met a suitable fate. Having been entrusted with a military command, he fell in with a band of rustic volunteers armed with pitchforks, who attacked and killed him—'tot illum ferreis tridentibus quot invocatus Amon in suis caracteribus effinxerat, appetentes percusserunt, vulneraverunt, transfixerunt.' The above account of Teseo Ambrogio is gathered mainly from this book (see ff. 2, 3, 14, 15, 140, 192, 200, &c.) and from Tiraboschi's *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, t. vii. pt. iii. pp. 1056, ff.; partly also from Widmanstadt's *Dedication* prefixed to his Syriac Gospels.

It is to be added that Postel (of whom hereafter) published a similar work on a smaller scale in Paris a few months earlier (January 1538). But the meagre fragment of Syriac exhibited in it (the Lord's Prayer) is barely legible, and is not printed from true types, but from a wood-block (as are all the other specimens of the languages included, except the Hebrew and Greek). The title is *Linguarum Duodecim Characteribus Differentium Alphabetum*, &c. The materials of this work were obtained from Ambrogio, who humorously complains that he had been outrun by the younger scholar as St. Peter by St. John, adding that he, like St. Peter, was nevertheless the first to enter in, and to see, and report what he saw, 'in literarum monumentis' (*Introd.* ff. 193, 201).

<sup>1</sup> The *Psalterium Chaldaicum ex Syria advectum* which Ambrogio designed to print was certainly the Syriac Psalter, as appears plainly from his account of his preparations (ff. 12 v<sup>o</sup>, 15, &c.). Several years before (1516) Agostino Giustiniani, Bishop of Nebbio, in Corsica, had printed in Genoa his remarkable *Octoplar Psalter*, the first essay towards a Polyglot Bible, of which four columns are occupied by the Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Chaldaee texts, three by Latin versions, and one by Scholia; but this Chaldaee is the 'Chaldaee Paraphrase.' Potken's *Tetraplar Psalter* of 1518 (Cologne) professes to give the Psalms in Hebrew, Greek, Chaldaee, and Latin; but in this work the column headed 'Chaldaee' is really Ethiopic—a mistake against which Ambrogio tells us (ff. 13 v<sup>o</sup>, 16) he had vainly warned the editor.



sight of it, or ceased to cultivate the knowledge into which Ambrogio had initiated him, throughout the succeeding years in which he worked his way up to high station and influence. His learning and abilities gained for him the patronage of many eminent persons, most of them great prelates, from whose favour he obtained not only the means of advancement in life, but also opportunities of prosecuting his favourite studies. In Spain, in the household of Inigo Lopez de Mendoza, Cardinal Archbishop of Burgos (1529-1539), he met Stunica (so well known as editor of the Complutensian Polyglot), and by his help acquired sufficient Arabic to read the Koran. In Italy, where he was known under the name of Lucretius, he studied that language (perhaps at an earlier date) under the auspices of the learned Egidio Antonini, Cardinal Bishop of Viterbo, who himself had learned it from Leo of Elvira, a Moorish exile from Spain; and it was apparently on the invitation of this prelate that he first took up his abode in Rome, where he remained till the Cardinal died in 1532. Through another of his patrons—a German like himself—Nicolas Schonberg, Archbishop of Capua (1520-1537), afterwards Cardinal, he obtained an introduction to Pope Clement VII., who appears to have taken him into his household as private secretary. We find that while occupying that position in 1533 he was permitted to expound the Copernican system at the Vatican in presence of Clement and several personages of his court, and was thereupon presented by this Pope with a fine MS. of the treatise of Alexander Aphrodisius *De Sensu et Sensibili*—an interesting fact, both as a proof of the wide range of his learning and as a contrast, as Tiraboschi remarks in relating it, to the treatment which in subsequent years Galileo met with at the hands of a later Pope. The MS. is preserved in the Royal Library of Munich, and contains a note written by Widmanstadt in which these circumstances are recorded.<sup>1</sup> He had now, as it seemed, found a patron from whom he might reasonably expect to obtain the means of printing the sacred text which Ambrogio had placed in his hands, but the death of the Pope in 1534 put an end to all hopes from him. Writing of himself afterwards, in June 1555,<sup>2</sup> he says that he

<sup>1</sup> For this interesting fact see Tiraboschi, vii. pt. i. p. 477, note (a). The MS. is now Cod. Gr. 151 (Munich); see Hardt's *Catal.* t. ii. p. 165.

<sup>2</sup> The date as originally printed was 'v Id. Januarii,' and the period of service, 'supra annos xxi'; but 'Junii' and 'xxii' have been substituted, by erasure and insertion with the pen, in all copies. We infer that he entered public life between January and June 1533. Our account of Widmanstadt's life and work is gathered (except where we have noted

had then completed his twenty-second year of State service, whence it follows that he reckoned 1533 as the first year of his public life, dating apparently from his entrance into the household of Clement. But he found time all along to pursue not only the study of Arabic but of Syriac, in which language he had for instructor one Simeon, a Maronite bishop. In the library of the Tolomei at Siena he found a second MS. of the Gospels in Syriac, of which he tells us he made a copy, and kept it along with 'the splendid gift of Teseo, received *four years* before.' His acquaintance with this family therefore is likewise to be assigned to the year 1533. Subsequently to this (as we learn from another, but, as will presently appear, hostile source) he entered after the death of Cardinal Schonberg (1537) into the service of Pope Paul III.; then went to Siena to be the guest of the Tolomei; and thence to Venice, at that time the headquarters of the typographic art, where he sought, but unsuccessfully, to find a printer for his purpose. After that, the same authority informs us that he returned to Germany, and sought to be employed as confidential agent by Moritz Hutten, then (1539) newly elected Bishop of Eichstadt, for whom he undertook a mission to Rome. He there became involved in a deadly quarrel with one Ambrose Gumpfenberg, a German who had been long resident in Rome, and with whom he had been on terms of intimacy in the time of Clement VII. We know the particulars of this matter, and the accusations of infamous crime brought by each party against the other, only from a virulent oration of Angelo Scalteli, Gumpfenberg's professional advocate, which has accidentally been preserved, and is the hostile authority above referred to.<sup>1</sup> A comparison of dates seems to prove that this Gumpfenberg is the enemy of whom Widmanstadt (writing in 1555) speaks as being incited by the devil to hinder the success of his sacred undertaking, and who (he says) was proved by his own confession to have hired an assassin to murder him in Tuscany; adding that four years later he renewed his hostility. This renewal, he adds, occurred ten years after the death of Clement VII.—that is, in 1543-4—and the attempt on his life is thus fixed to 1539-40. The time and place thus determined agree with the facts that Moritz Hutten was consecrated in 1539, and that

other sources of information) from the *Dedication*, concluding *Epistle*, and occasional notes, which accompany his Syriac New Testament, and from the *Preface* and *Conclusion* of the first edition (1556) of his *Elementa*.

<sup>1</sup> See Schelhorn, *Amanitates Litter.* t. xiii. pp. 468-500, where the oration is given at length; also pp. 223 sqq.

(according to Scalteli) Widmanstadt, when sent to Rome by Hutten soon after that event, visited Siena on his way, and was there admitted Doctor of Laws. Scalteli's account is, that Widmanstadt induced the University to grant him this degree by presenting the officials with a number of Augsburg watches of chased brass and gold (such as were then prized as a novelty, but are now treasured as curiosities in the cabinets of collectors) which had been entrusted to him by Hutten to be used as gifts to conciliate the goodwill of the prelates of the Roman Court. But this, as well as the fouler charges contained in the scurrilous invective of this hired accuser, may be dismissed as malignant slander; for he adduces no evidence in support of them beyond the statements that Widmanstadt when in Italy was young and handsome, that he found favour with men of rank and wealth, that he dressed better and rode a better horse than (in the opinion of his enemies) was suitable to his station and birth, and that a marriage had been arranged between him and a lady of the noble house of the Tolomei, but was broken off; to which it is gravely added that he had assumed a name not his own, the name, too, of the great Epicurean poet—a clear proof of his immorality and irreligion!

It cannot be doubted that Widmanstadt came out of this painful controversy with character unstained, for we find him immediately after in the confidential employment of a far greater prelate—Otho, Bishop of Augsburg. In January 1543 he published a work on the life and doctrine of Mohammed—partly a reprint of treatises translated by former writers from the Arabic, partly his own production. The *Dedication* of this book to Lewis, Duke of Bavaria, informs us that he was then a Bavarian Senator, but was living at the time of writing in retirement at Landshut. Before the year 1551, however, he had finally withdrawn from this service and settled with his wife and children on an estate near his native place. From this peaceful retreat he was soon forced to fly, for in that year the invasion of the Suabian territory by Maurice, Elector of Saxony, drove him to seek refuge in the Austrian dominions. There, however, he immediately found not only protection but favour from Ferdinand, King of Hungary and Bohemia and Duke of Austria, soon afterwards Emperor, who made him a Senator, and subsequently Chancellor of Lower Austria. Through all these vicissitudes of fortune, however, Widmanstadt never abated in his zeal for Biblical learning; and in 1553 we find him taking counsel with his old preceptor, Jacob Jonas, now a brother Senator, and with another like-minded friend of the

same rank, George Gienger, concerning the ways and means of bringing the Syriac language and the Syriac version within the reach of European scholars. In the autumn of that year, on his way back to his home at Vienna from Heilbronn, where he had attended his royal master at a conference of the German princes, he unexpectedly met a Syrian priest, Moses, who had come from Italy in quest of him, a *rencontre* which at once brought about the long-desired result. To explain it, it is necessary to go back three or four years in our narrative.

This Moses came, not like the Syrians whom we have before had occasion to mention, from the Lebanon, but from Mardin in Mesopotamia, the seat of the Jacobite Patriarchs, who styled themselves 'of Antioch,' all of them assuming the name of Ignatius. He describes himself as a disciple and legate of Ignatius, Patriarch of Antioch, sent to Popes Paul III. and Julius III., to abjure on behalf of the Jacobite Church the errors of the Monophysite heresy, and to seek protection and sundry favours, among others the means of printing the Syriac New Testament. His *Profession of Faith* is extant, having been printed not long after by Andreas Masius (Maes), an eminent Flemish scholar, lawyer, and statesman, who learnt Syriac from him while they were both sojourners in Rome.<sup>1</sup> He is evidently the Moses whose name is signed as 'Scribe' in a MS. (Harl. 5512) in the British Museum,<sup>2</sup> containing the Roman Mass in Latin written in Syriac characters, followed by a collection of Syriac Liturgies. This MS. is dated in 1549, and proves that Moses arrived in Rome in or before that year, being the year of the death of Paul III. and the accession of Julius III. Its contents suggest the probability that he, like the Maronite already mentioned, had sought permission to say Mass in the capital of the Western Church. He seems, however, to have met with little encouragement from either Pope. No pecuniary help was to be had; the very validity of his orders was questioned, as we learn from a letter of complaint written by him to Masius in 1553; and the part of his commission with which we are concerned, the printing of the Peshitto New Testament, found no favour at Rome. Disappointed there, he proceeded to Venice in 1553, attracted thither, no doubt, as Widmanstadt

<sup>1</sup> See Masius, *Præf.* to the *De Paradiso* of Moses Bar-Cepha, to which work is subjoined (pp. 257, 264) the *Profession of Faith* of Moses of Mardin, being chiefly an abjuration of all that was distinctive of Monophysite doctrine, Eutychianism being specified by name (p. 260), and the authority of the Council of Chalcedon being expressly admitted.

<sup>2</sup> See Wright's *Catal.* pp. 214-16.

had been before, by the fame of the Aldine press, then in the hands of Paul Manutius, son of Aldus ; and perhaps still more by that of Daniel Bomberg, whose splendid editions of the Hebrew Bible had within a few years before been executed in the same city. Here also he met with failure, but was put on the way that led to success. Guillaume Postel (of whom we shall presently have occasion to speak further), a Frenchman, remarkable alike for his varied acquirements and for his manifold adventures and delusions, formerly a resident in Venice, where he was almoner of the Hospital of SS. John and Paul,<sup>1</sup> had recently (1550-51) returned thither from travelling in the East, and had brought with him from Damascus a MS. of the Syriac New Testament for Bomberg. This eccentric person had in former years been acquainted not only with Ambrogio (by whom it seems he was initiated into the elements of Syriac and of many other little-known tongues), but also with Widmanstadt. To Widmanstadt accordingly, as a man willing and able to help him in his task by commending him to the patronage of the Duke of Bavaria, Moses, by the advice of Postel, resolved to apply ; and the question then arose how to effect the journey to Suabia—for though this was in the summer or early autumn of 1553, tidings had not yet reached Postel of the enforced flight of Widmanstadt from his Suabian home in consequence of the war of 1551-2, and of his change of abode to Vienna and his position under King Ferdinand.

The opportunity of a safe escort offered itself, strange to say, in consequence of events in England. The recent accession (June 1553) of Mary to the throne on the death of Edward VI. had determined Pope Julius to send Cardinal Reginald Pole to her, to remove the interdict from her kingdom. Moses obtained an introduction to this great personage, who (probably on the strength of a letter of commendation, which was the only favour bestowed by the Pope on the Syrian priest) consented to give him protection and the means of reaching his destination. In September, Pole, on the summons of the Pope, left his retirement at Maguzzano on the Lago di Garda for Trent ; and in the train of the legate of the Roman Pontiff, the legate of the Syrian Patriarch,

<sup>1</sup> The story of this Postel and his extravagant doctrines, and his 'Mère Joanne'—a Venetian woman whom he announced as his 'Virgin Mother'—recalls the hallucinations of Montanus. He was born in Normandy in 1510, and after a life of many vicissitudes (including two imprisonments on charges of heresy), died in 1581. See the article 'Postel' in the *Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit.* of Chauffepié, especially the letters of Postel to Masius given in the notes.

bound on a mission so widely different from that of his protector, took his journey northward. They probably followed the route of the Brenner and passed through Innsbrück; but their first recorded halting-place was Augsburg, from which city they proceeded to Dillingen, where (as is well known) Pole was afterwards long detained by the Emperor's orders. This city lay on Widmanstadt's road from Heilbronn to Vienna; and inasmuch as it not only lay in his native Suabia, but was the seat of a university recently founded by his former master, Otho of Augsburg, we may assume that Widmanstadt would find himself at home there, and would make it a stopping-place on his journey. Here, therefore, it is probable these two men met, the Syrian priest and the German statesman, bent on a common object, which to the latter had been the hope of half his lifetime, and to the former was the discharge of a trust which had sent him out of the heart of Asia into the heart of Europe, across the sea from the East to Italy, across the Alps from Italy to Germany. A meeting so remarkable was followed by immediate results. Widmanstadt conducted Moses without delay to Vienna, and presented him to Ferdinand. This great and enlightened prince, who was at this time engaged in re-establishing his University of Vienna after the destruction wrought in that city a few years before by the Turks, at once, with truly royal munificence, consented to bear the expenses of printing the sacred text according to the Patriarch's desire. Moses was retained at a liberal salary<sup>1</sup> to superintend the work, to which Widmanstadt gave such part of his time as he could snatch from his hours of rest after the affairs of State which occupied his days. An artist, Caspar Crapht, undertook to engrave in steel the punches for striking the matrices; the types (whose admirable delicacy and distinctness no subsequent typefounder has excelled) were cast in tin,<sup>2</sup> and Michael Cymbermann was employed to execute the printing.

<sup>1</sup> 'Habuit a rege 700 florenos toto biennio,' says Masius, in a note to one of the Letters of Moses (*Symbola Syr.*; see below, p. 275, n. 3).

<sup>2</sup> It is usually stated that *steel types* were made for this admirable work, but this is a mistake. Its colophon states that 'Caspar Craphtus . . . *characteres* Syros ex Norici ferri acie *sculpebat*,' which merely means that the 'punches' (Ital. *punzioni*, Fr. *poinceaux*, or Lat. *patrices*), whence were struck the (copper) matrices for casting the type, were of steel, as at the present day. To *cut steel types* in sufficient quantity would have been impracticable; and the art of casting steel was then unknown, not to mention that steel would be a metal quite unsuitable for types. (See Postel's letter at p. 228 of Chaufepié's article referred to above, p. 270, n.) Moses, in a note prefixed to the transcript presented by him to Ferdinand, expressly states that the printing was executed *typis stanneis*. There is



Thus was produced the *Editio Princeps* of the Syriac New Testament, the first book ever printed in that language. Widmanstadt tells us (not being aware as it seems of the existence of the *Introductio* of Ambrogio which we have described) that till then Syriac characters had never been seen in Europe, except in books of magic, and in them so distorted as to be barely recognizable. The printing was so promptly executed that the Gospels were struck off on May 18, 1555, the Pauline Epistles on July 18, the Acts on August 14; and the book, including the Jacobite Tables of Lessons (into which the text is divided), was finally completed on September 27. It contains the whole Peshitto New Testament, but not the books which that version excludes (viz. the Apocalypse, and the four shorter Catholic Epistles—2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude). Its text, after the usage of nearly all Syriac MSS., is but partly furnished with vowels. Many editorial memoranda are attached to the several parts of the work, some in Latin written by Widmanstadt, others in Syriac by Moses. It professes to exhibit a text based on two MSS., a statement not easy to understand; for besides the copy brought by Moses, which was a complete New Testament, we have heard of two as being in the possession of Widmanstadt, but both of them of the Gospels only. Thus there appear to have been three available for the Gospels and but one for the remaining books; and in fact it is to the Gospels only that the mention of 'two MSS.' relates. The Imperial Library of Vienna contains (*Cod. MS. Ling. Orient.* 258, in Nessel's *Catalogue*) a copy of the Gospels written by Moses in 1554 at Vienna; but this was merely a transcript presented by him to the King, and perhaps made for the printer's use; the MS. brought by him from the East was of some antiquity, and written at Mozul.<sup>1</sup> Neither it, nor either of Widmanstadt's copies, is recorded as now preserved in Vienna or in any other European library. Postel indeed, who, as we have already said, had in his hands another copy, when apprised by a letter from Moses of the favourable reception he had found in Vienna, hurried unbidden to that city. He was welcomed there by Widmanstadt as a fellow-worker, and received from Ferdinand a sum of two hundred gold florins for the services he undertook to

other evidence that tin was at that time used by some typefounders, as it still is, though exceptionally, the usual type-metal of modern times being lead with an alloy of antimony.

<sup>1</sup> Masius, *Introd. to Grammatica Syriaca*; see also Postel's *Dedication* (to Ferdinand) of his *De Cosmographica Disciplina* (1561), and his letter in *Chaufepié*, p. 227.



render in preparing the types. But that his MS. was not used in forming the text is certain. He asserts, in an extant letter to Masius, that when compared with the MS. brought by Moses it was found 'to differ from it not one jot.' Yet when it was afterwards lent by its owner, the younger Bomberg of Cologne, to Guy le Fevre de la Boderie, who, with the help of Masius, collated it for the *Biblia Regia* of 1572, many corrections of the text of the *Editio Princeps* were derived from it, proving the statement of Postel to be as inaccurate as might be expected from so flighty a person. This MS. is now in the Library of the University of Leiden (*Cod. Syr.* 1198);<sup>1</sup> it consists of two volumes, written by different hands, both about the year 1200. If Moses' MS. was older than these, as Postel states, it must have been of the twelfth century at latest. Whatever other aid Postel may or might have given in the preparation of the work was cut short by his abrupt departure, some time in 1554, in an alarm (perhaps imaginary) of personal danger from some enemy to us unknown. Before he left, however, he honestly surrendered the two hundred florins, giving half to Moses and half to the printer. A few days later, on reaching the territory of the Venetian Republic, he was arrested and cast into prison on a charge of having murdered a Franciscan friar, one Julius of Brescia, being mistaken for the true assassin, another Franciscan, Felix of Naples, whom he had the misfortune to resemble in person. He escaped next day, but was reduced to such straits as to be obliged not long after to pawn his collections of MSS. to the Duke of Bavaria (in 1555) for two hundred ducats. We next hear of him as imprisoned by Pope Paul IV. on a charge of heresy, and not released till the death of that pontiff in 1559. His life was prolonged many years beyond this date, but presents no further points of contact with our subject. We leave him, therefore, and return to Widmanstadt and his completed work.

It is impossible not to sympathize with the spirit of thankful satisfaction that animates the *Dedication* and concluding *Epistle*, prefixed and appended by him to the book. He was, no doubt, over-sanguine in his estimate of probable benefit to the Eastern Churches, and of the prospect of a reunion of Christendom, to ensue from the successful accomplishment of the task laid upon him by Teseo Ambrogio; but there can be no question that he worked for its fulfilment in single-

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Land ap. De Goeje's *Catal. Codd. Orient. Biblioth. Acad. Lugd.-Bat.*; also de la Boderie's *Præf. to Biblia Regia*, t. iv., and the contract of loan of the MS. made at Cologne, subjoined to it.

hearted religious enthusiasm, and with no sidelong eye to any selfish object. It is a feature of the age to which he belonged that not a few of the men who did most to promote Biblical learning were not ecclesiastics but lay lawyers (as Masius, whom we have already mentioned); but none of these has won for himself a higher claim on the gratitude of Biblical scholars than Widmanstadt. He never appears to have allowed his ambition for worldly advancement to come in the way of his beloved studies; on the contrary, office and station when attained were, as we have seen, used by him as means towards the end which from his youth up he had kept steadily in view in the pursuit of those studies, and to that end he gave up the nights of a laborious life whose days were taken up with his official duties. He followed up the completion of his Syriac New Testament by publishing a few months later his *Syriacæ Linguae Prima Elementa* (Vienna, November 1555–February 1556), in which he commends the study of Syriac to two young kinsmen, for whose use he had drawn up this little manual, promises them a grammar and lexicon of the language which he has in preparation, and appends the Ter Sanctus, the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, the Magnificat, and a few prayers in Syriac, adding an expression of regret that time and space do not permit him to give some extracts from the Liturgies of St. John and St. Peter, and of Pope Xystus, and others.<sup>1</sup> A MS. Syriac Missal, containing all these Liturgies, with a note of its purchase by Widmanstadt at Augsburg in 1550 from a Maronite, is now in the Royal Library at Munich (*Orient.* 146); and in the same collection is another MS. (*Orient.* 60), the first part of which is the Grammar of Gregory Barhebraeus in Syriac, with a translation by Widmanstadt partly into Latin and partly into Italian; with a second part subjoined, a Syro-Arabic-Latin Lexicon, the Latin supplied by him, the Arabic by Moses, dated Vienna, November 1555.<sup>2</sup> We learn from one of the letters of the elder Joachim Camerarius (*Epp.* lib. ii. p. 113) that Widmanstadt's library was in the hands of George Sigismund Seld in or before 1559; and we have the authority of Masius (who mentions this Grammar and Lexicon in his *Dedic.*

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that this book, though executed by the same printer as the New Testament, is in a completely different type. A second edition of it was printed by Plantin after Widmanstadt's death (Antwerp, 1572), apparently from the same Syriac types as the former. This edition adds the Prayer of Christ (John xvii.), the Apostles' Hymn (Acts iv. 24–30), and the Canticle of Esaias (Isa. xlv. 8), all in Syriac, but omits the *Dedication and Conclusion*.

<sup>2</sup> Munich *Catal.* t. i. pt. iv. pp. 109 sqq.

to *Linguae Syr. Gramm.*, written in 1570) for the statement that it was purchased by the Duke of Bavaria, which is confirmed by the fact that these MSS., and many others bearing Widmanstadt's name, are now in the Munich collection. We infer, therefore, that he had died in or before 1559, leaving his learned labour unfinished.<sup>1</sup> So far as we know, he never obtained the release from the yoke of State service which at the close of his *Dedication* of the Gospels he pathetically entreates his royal patron to grant.<sup>2</sup> But though he was not permitted to complete his proposed contributions to the promotion of Syriac learning, he had done enough to secure his unassailable and lasting place in the regard of all Syriac scholars; and the *Editio Princeps* of the Peshitto New Testament, due as it is mainly to his persevering and well-directed energy, is his proper and abiding monument, bearing as it universally and fitly does the title of the Text of Widmanstadt.

Of Moses of Mardin, his colleague in the work, we are compelled to judge very differently. At first sight it might seem as if, in speaking of 'Widmanstadt's text,' one was unjustly ascribing to the German the credit in part, if not mainly, deserved by the Syrian. But we believe that in this case the general voice has spoken rightly, and given honour where honour is due. No doubt Moses pursued his purpose with a persistency that looks like devotion to a sacred mission, and claims our sympathy. Letters of his are extant, addressed to Masius (one of which has been printed in full in the original Syriac, and the rest summarized, by Andreas Müller in his *Symbolæ Syriacæ*<sup>3</sup>), in which he gives details of the difficulties and repulses which, as we have seen, encountered him when he reached Europe. According to his own account, he arrived, not only penniless, but in debt, having

<sup>1</sup> Vergerio (see below, p. 286, n. 1), writing on March 1, 1559, states that Widmanstadt died 'statim post eam editionem.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Cum supra annos xxii in fluctuum Reipublicæ motu et agitatione cum dignitate vixerim, ultraque mediam ætatem proventus sim, desiderio portus, in quem honesti otii præsidia subducam, me teneri aut quietis et tranquillitatis beneficium a M.T. expectare nemo sapiens mirabitur, nemo frugi et modestus reprehendet, nemoque nisi æstimator improbus inertiam turpem poterit interpretari. Quod si, uti spero, et otium illud beatum et redditum in patriam impetravero, Majestati Tuæ non solum otii fructus sed et uxoris et liberorum, quos mihi Pannonicum hoc cælum adversa adhuc valetudine addictos ex pluribus heic amissis reliquos fecit, incolumitatem debere me perpetuo profitebor.'

<sup>3</sup> Published at Berlin, 1673. See pp. 5-11, and Diss. i., of this work. The original letters, with the reply of Masius (in Syriac) to the first, are stated by the editor (p. 3) to be preserved in the Library of the Elector of Brandenburg at Cöln (on the Spree). They are now at Berlin in the Royal Library; see Sachau's *Kursus Verzeichniss*, p. 35.

been forced to borrow thirty gold scudi in Cyprus on his way. At Rome fifty were promised him by the Roman prelates; but though he was kept for months, if not years, waiting for this bounty, they were never paid. He was thus compelled to work for his bread, transcribing Syriac MSS. for sale to divers collectors; and several specimens of his penmanship (some of which we have already noticed) are to be found in European libraries. He was seeking to find means of making his way to Augsburg, there to lay his case before the wealthy patron of letters, John James Fugger, when the advice of Postel, backed by that of Renialm, the agent at Venice of the deceased Bomberg, directed him to Widmanstadt. In Vienna he appears to have found Widmanstadt less friendly<sup>1</sup> and Ferdinand less bountiful than he had hoped. Even his correspondent Masius disappointed him in the matter of openhandedness. He seems to have been obliged to be cautious about asserting his priestly character, for we find him requesting Masius not to address him as 'Padre'; and at first he appeared in Vienna in the dress of a laic, until the kindness of Camerarius<sup>2</sup> enabled him to resume the sacerdotal habit. But these letters give an unpleasant insight into the character and motives of the man: one detects in their tone the whine of the professional begging-letter writer; and on their evidence alone one cannot hesitate to form a low opinion of the writer. And the marginal notes appended to them by Masius, to whom most of them were addressed, help us to judge what credit is to be given to the complaints with which they are filled. Against a passage in one, where Moses grumbles at the parsimony of Widmanstadt, Masius writes 'Fallit ingratus.' At another place, where the writer is indignant because his share of the printed copies is but two hundred, and even these given him by the King against the Chancellor's advice, Masius explains: 'CC exemplaribus faciendum erat periculum de fide ejus.' And again he expresses his mind more at large: 'In hac Epistola potes Syrum ingenium cognoscere . . . homo ingrattissimus, oblitus omnium beneficiorum, quæ ego in ipsum ipse in me contulisse simulat per summam impudentiam.' These are the comments of a

<sup>1</sup> Andreas Müller remarks (Diss. i. p. 9) that Moses never names Widmanstadt in these letters, being unaware that he is the 'Lucretius' of whom Moses complains so bitterly.

<sup>2</sup> This, no doubt, was the Joachim Camerarius to whose *Epistles* we have already referred—the friend of Melancthon. At this time he was the representative of the city of Nuremberg in the Diet of Augsburg, and is known to have been highly esteemed and invited to Vienna by Ferdinand.

man who knew Moses long and well, and had befriended him effectively—a man not only of learning, but also of character and position, and of wide knowledge of the world (for Masius held at this time high office in the Duchy of Cleves), well acquainted, too, with the persons and circumstances mentioned in these letters. We cannot doubt that his animadversions are as just as they are severe, and that Moses slandered his benefactors. Untruthful and ungrateful, untrustworthy and shameless, is the verdict of Masius on him; mean, importunate, and greedy are the epithets which every reader of his letters will add. One is forced to suspect that the sacred volume which he had been commissioned to bring from the East was valued by him chiefly as an introduction to the learned scholars of Europe and their wealthy patrons; and the suspicion finds a painful confirmation in the fact that after offering to sell his two hundred copies of the printed text to Masius, who declined the purchase, he finally found another buyer, who paid him twenty-two imperials for them, and forty thalers for some MSS. These latter were no doubt (as we may infer from the price) copies in his own writing, such as those above referred to; the MS. of the New Testament was, as we have seen, ancient, and therefore of higher value; and probably it was the Patriarch's property, so that Moses could not sell it, but was bound to restore it to its owner on his return to his own country. That he should sell his share of the printed copies and profit by the sale was fair enough: but by selling them in Europe he defeated the purpose of Ferdinand and Widmanstadt, which was to secure their circulation in the Syrian Churches; and thus justified the prudence of the former in limiting the number allotted to him, and the distrust of the latter, who would not have allowed him any. We know that Moses went back to the East, for Widmanstadt, in a note appended to the printed book, speaks of him as expected to bring with him on his return to Europe the Syriac version of the portions of the New Testament not included in the Peshitto. It seems incredible that Widmanstadt, therefore, with this reason for desiring his return, should have so treated him as to discourage him from revisiting Europe; and if, as it appears, he never returned, the cause may well have been that he was conscious of having so behaved as to be unwilling to face his former benefactors. In the light of all these facts we learn what value to attach to his profession of faith, made at Rome and preserved for us by Masius (see above, p. 269, *n.* 1), in which he accepts absolutely the doctrine of the Double Procession

of the Holy Ghost, though denied by all the Eastern Churches, and renounces the distinctive tenets (Monophysite and even Monothelite) of the Jacobite Church which he represented. No doubt he would have accepted or renounced as many more doctrines with no less cheerfulness, if by so doing he could have induced the Roman prelates, in reward of his compliance, to promise, and pay, a suitable amount in gold scudi.

Whether the Patriarch, from whom Moses had his credentials, was prepared to endorse his abjuration of the cherished articles of the Jacobite communion we cannot tell, nor yet how far he may have been sincerely desirous to benefit his Church by multiplying copies of the New Testament in Syriac. But, whether or no, it would be unjust to blame Popes Paul and Julius for their cold reception of his legate. Very possibly they may have looked with no great favour on the proposal to make known to European theologians a version of the Scriptures claiming such high antiquity and consequent authority—invested, too, with a peculiar sanctity as being written in the language of the inspired Apostles, of the blessed Virgin Mother, and of the Lord Himself. This would seem a formidable rival to set up against the Latin Vulgate and its claims to exclusive prerogative. And one, regarding the narrative of Moses and his journeys from an Anglican's point of view, is tempted to contrast the mission of the humble Syrian priest, sent by an Eastern patriarch to obtain the means of diffusing Scriptural knowledge in Syriac through the Churches of Syria, with the mission of the great English Cardinal in whose train he journeyed, commissioned by the mighty Patriarch of the West to stop the free course of the Gospel in the English tongue among English readers. But the analogy thus suggested between the Syriac New Testament and the translations made by the Reformers, such as Tindal's or Luther's, is an unreal one, for Syriac had then long ceased to be vernacular among Eastern Christians, though used, as it still is, in the offices of the Jacobite and Maronite Churches; so that the printing of the Peshitto—the Syriac Vulgate, as it has been very properly called—like the printing of the Hieronymian Latin Bible, was a work for the benefit of the clergy rather than of the laity.

But apart from the matter of the Peshitto, it is certain that the Roman pontiffs and their advisers had ample reason, of old date, to distrust overtures from Jacobite patriarchs. They cannot have forgotten how, a century before (as the Acts of the



Council of Florence and a bull of Pope Eugene IV. attest<sup>1</sup>), the then Jacobite Patriarch, Ignatius IX. (Behenan), made his submission to the Pope, with a recantation of his heresies as ample as that now offered by the legate of the Ignatius of the year 1549; unlike his orthodox rival patriarch, Dorotheus, who protested against and denounced the definition agreed on as part of the Florentine compromise: and yet it was notorious that his professions were hollow, and the Jacobite body, after a hundred years and more had elapsed, remained still unreconciled to Rome. It was no doubt remembered also how, yet two centuries farther back, an earlier Ignatius had deceived Gregory IX., as his successor deceived Eugene IV. The English chronicler, Matthew Paris, records how, in the year 1237,<sup>2</sup> the Roman court was elated by the tidings, conveyed in a letter from Philip, Prior of the Dominicans of the Holy Land, that in Jerusalem on Palm Sunday of that year the Antiochian Patriarch had abjured all the errors of his communion and acknowledged the Roman supremacy; and further that the Patriarch of Alexandria had sent a letter assuring them of his readiness to do the same. The chronicler expresses his opinion that this submission of the Patriarch of Antioch was made, not in good faith, but through fear of the Tartars (at this time the terror of Christendom<sup>3</sup>), against whom, he adds, that prelate had previously applied for protection to the Saracens, but in vain. When the alarm passed away, the Patriarch, he concludes, 'a fide turpiter resilivit.' The *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*<sup>4</sup> of Gregory Barhebræus enables us to identify this supple prelate as Ignatius II. (David), Jacobite Patriarch from 1222 to 1253, whose visit to Jerusalem is recorded by the Syrian as well as by the English annalist, while its date is fixed by the history of the Patriarchs of Alexandria (Renaudot, p. 579), and accurately coincides with that assigned by Matthew Paris. Both these last-named narratives record a quarrel between the rival Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria (both Monophysites), which no doubt supplied the immediate motive for the submission made by the former and promised by the latter. It is worth relating as a sample of the *morale* of the highest ecclesiastics of the Monophysite communion of that day. At the time of the

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Conc. Florent.* (Rome, 1638), p. 384; *Acta Conciliorum* (Paris, 1714), t. ix. c. 1040.

<sup>2</sup> P. 372 (edition of London, 1684); see also the Pope's letter to the Patriarch in Raynald's *Continuation of Baronius' Annales*, t. xiii. s. a. 1237, cc. 87, 88.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. lxiv. §§ i. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Edition of Abbeloos and Lamy (1874), t. ii. cc. 645, 653-663.



visit of Ignatius II. to Jerusalem, the Alexandrian Patriarch, Cyril Bar-Laklak, a man prone to irregular proceedings, had recently invaded the prerogative of his Antiochian brother by consecrating a metropolitan of Jerusalem for those of his nation who dwelt in the Holy City—an uncanonical act which appears to have scandalized his own bishops, who a few years later made it one of the articles of reformation forced by them on him that neither patriarch nor bishop should ordain outside his own jurisdiction. Ignatius, naturally resenting this usurpation, resolved 'to drive out nail by nail'—to retaliate by consecrating a metropolitan for Abyssinia, which was an appendage to the province of his rival. But before resorting to this extreme measure he thought it prudent to ask the sanction of the chief representatives of 'the Franks' in Jerusalem, which was at this time in Christian hands. Accordingly he sent his confidential agent, Saliba Haripha, to 'the brethren, the teachers' (that is, as it seems, the heads of the Dominicans, the 'Ordo Prædicatorum,' whom Barhebræus designates as the *Pherphershûrâye*<sup>1</sup>), who were at this time predominant in the Holy City, and had received him with honour on his arrival and lodged him in one of their monasteries. These Franks, however, declined to approve of the proposed proceeding as being hasty and irregular, and advised delay, promising to remonstrate with Cyril and force him to withdraw his metropolitan. Ignatius, in his anger and disappointment at this refusal, in defiance of their injunction, that very day consecrated one Thomas, a Nubian, to the Abyssinian metropolitanate, and excommunicated the metropolitan whom Cyril had sent to Jerusalem. The Dominicans, hearing of this rash act, were highly indignant, and, inviting the heads of the Templars and Hospitallers to join them, they repaired to the lodging of Ignatius, entered his apartment abruptly, sat down in his presence without salutation, and, after taking him sharply to task for his arrogant usurpation and contemptuous disregard of their message, they called on him to explain his conduct. The Patriarch was dismayed, and sat in silence, pale and trembling. But the serviceable Haripha at his side preserved his presence of mind; he made a sign to

<sup>1</sup> AbbeLoos and Lamy (p. 653 *note*) conjecture that by this term are denoted the *Fratres Minores*, or Franciscans, on the ground that at the time of this incident these were the only religious orders in the Holy Land, besides the Templars and Hospitallers. But the letter of the Dominican Prior above referred to proves that the *Prædicatores* also were at Jerusalem in 1237, and goes far to identify them as the *Pherphershûrâye*—unless we are to suppose that the Patriarch was first repelled by the Franciscans, and then turned to the rival fraternity.

18  
h  
on  
ca  
I  
D  
y  
't  
be  
sa  
cc  
m  
in  
an  
m  
wh  
O  
cu  
of  
fro  
rec  
su  
ne  
say  
Fi  
un  
the  
he  
wh  
ad  
ne  
wo  
of  
of  
cer  
pre  
(lik  
Mo  
tial  
(ap  
(Jo  
7197  
the  
Leq

his master, and whispered to him in Syriac, 'Lay the blame on me; better that I should be rebuked than you.' Ignatius, catching the hint, found breath to murmur, 'Here is the man I sent to you; he told me you approved: ask him.' The Dominican Prior turned to Haripha: 'Did I desire you to tell your master so?' 'Yes,' replied Haripha without hesitation; 'that was what I understood you to say.' 'The Lord judge between me and you,' exclaimed the astonished Prior. Then said the chief of the Franks (his Templar and Hospitaller colleagues) to the Prior: 'The prelate is not to blame for misunderstanding you; the fact is, you do not speak Arabic intelligibly.' And thus their displeasure was turned aside, and they apologized and departed satisfied. When the apartment was clear of them the Patriarch turned to his servant, whose ready wit had done him such service: 'If I forget thee, O Haripha,' he exclaimed, 'may my right hand forget, so cunningly hast thou rescued me this day from the rebuke of these tyrants.' This occurrence took place, as appears from Barhebraeus, some time before Easter; and the formal recantation and submission of Palm Sunday were presumably made by Ignatius to secure the favour he had so nearly forfeited. Then, no doubt, followed the letter or message from Cyril, promising to do as his adversary had done. Finally, however, the Franks espoused the side of Cyril, whose uncanonical aggression was in their eyes a less offence than the disobedience of Ignatius; and the Coptic metropolitan held his ground. But we can readily imagine how eagerly, while this dispute was pending, the Syrian, with Haripha for adviser, and the Copt, whose history shows him to have needed no one to teach him the arts of deceit and corruption, would bid against one another in offering all possible sacrifices of dignity, principle, and creed to win the favour and protection of the Frank.

But it is time to return to the Ignatii of the sixteenth century. It is but too certain that among them were men prepared to surrender under sufficient pressure not merely (like their predecessors of the thirteenth and fourteenth) the Monophysite tenets distinctive of their Church, but the Christian faith itself. In 1517, we learn from a Syriac annalist (ap. *Assem. Biblioth. Orient.* t. ii. p. 324), Ignatius XIII. (Joshua) 'Hagarized,'<sup>1</sup> that is, abjured Christ for Islam. And

<sup>1</sup> This shameful fact is also stated in a note inserted in the MS. Rich. 7197 in the British Museum (Rosen-Forshall, *Catal.* p. 89). We follow the numbering of these Ignatii given by Assemani in preference to that of Lequien in his *Oriens Christiana*.

Ignatius XVII. (Nehemet Allah), who was Patriarch in 1560, and must therefore have been either the Patriarch who sent Moses on his mission, or his immediate successor,<sup>1</sup> followed the example of this apostasy. The former of these unhappy men, after recanting and submitting to degrading penance, was reinstated in the patriarchal throne! The latter, repenting of his treason against the faith, fled to Rome and there lived many years under the protection of Gregory XIII. He is mentioned by an Italian physician, Michael Mercatus (in his *Metallotheca*, p. 227), who met him in Rome, as possessing a large knowledge of medicine. He had, or feigned, a hope that Ignatius XVIII. (David), his brother and successor (consecrated in 1576), would be found disposed to reconcile himself to the Roman See; and at his advice Gregory sent Leonardo, Bishop of Sidon in 1583, as Apostolic Nuncio to this David, to receive his profession of orthodoxy and his submission. But Leonardo, on his return to Rome after the death of Gregory (1585), reported to Sixtus V. the unsatisfactory result of his mission.<sup>2</sup>

Whether these Syrians, demoralized as this history shows them to have been into the cowardice and falsehood so often engendered by persecution in a downtrodden people, ever received any portion of the benefit designed for them by Ferdinand and his Chancellor we are not informed; and there seems to be no evidence that the King's intention of dividing between the Maronite and Jacobite Patriarchs three hundred of the thousand copies of which the edition consisted, was ever carried out. We revert to the history of its circulation in Europe. Many copies of it with the proper date (1555) are to be found in the libraries of the Continent and of our own country, and are highly prized; copies bearing date 1562 are more numerous, and are of the same edition, re-dated on the back of the title-page. The probable explanation of this difference is that the book, of which five hundred copies were retained for European use, was not offered for sale in the ordinary way till 1562. Within a very few years the *Editio*

<sup>1</sup> The dates of many of these patriarchs are uncertain. An Ignatius (Abdallah), unknown to Assemani, is proved to have been patriarch in 1528 and 1536 by entries in the British Museum MSS., Arund. Orient. 11 and 53 (Rosen-Forshall, pp. 61, 95). Possibly this Abdallah, and not Nehemet, was the Ignatius of 1549 who sent Moses of Mardin to Europe.

<sup>2</sup> Assem. *B. O. t. i.* p. 536. The date of this David's elevation to the patriarchate is recorded in the colophon of a Bodleian MS. (Hunt, 521) as A.Gr. 1887—that is (as usually reckoned) A.D. 1576, but 1578 seems to be intended (Payne Smith, *Catal.* c. 562). The writer of this MS., Pilatus, succeeded David as patriarch.

*Princeps* was followed up by a second—one which attests how quick the party of the Reformation were to discern the importance of the Syriac version, for it was prepared, in 1569, by Tremellius, a converted Jew, professor in the University of Heidelberg, a *protégé* of Frederick III., Elector Palatine, and of our own Elizabeth, to whom he dedicated the splendid triglot (but tetraplar) volume in which this version occupies the third column, standing side by side with the Greek original and with Beza's Latin translation. It was printed by Henry [II.] Stephens at Geneva; and though Hebrew characters are employed in it for lack of Syriac type, it is in three respects an advance on Widmanstadt's text—that Tremellius has attempted to give the vocalization fully, that he has added a close Latin translation of it as a fourth column, and that he used for his text a second MS. belonging to the Elector's library.<sup>1</sup> Three years later, this edition was cast into the shade by a third—that included in the great Antwerp Polyglot (better known as the *Biblia Regia*, because printed under the auspices of Philip II. of Spain by Plantin in 1572), for which, as we have above noted, Postel's MS. was collated by de la Boderie, who added to it an improved Latin version. In this great work, as in the *Editio Princeps*, the Syriac character was again employed, and, as in it, with but partial vocalization. But in two separate editions of the Syriac text (8vo and 16mo) issued soon after (1574-5) from the same press, the Hebrew type, without vowels, was again resorted to; as also in an edition printed at Paris in 1582 by de la Boderie on his own account, which has for its distinguishing feature an interlinear Latin version. To both Plantin's small editions there was subjoined an appendix of further various readings gathered by his son-in-law, Francis Rapheleng, from the same MS. of Postel;<sup>2</sup> but the edition published in 1621 by Trost at Cothen was the first to set the useful example, followed by many of its successors, of giving a complete table of the

<sup>1</sup> This MS. was probably one of the Palatine collection of MSS. that were sent by Maximilian of Bavaria, after the taking of Heidelberg and the seizure of the library by De Tilly in 1622, as a present to Gregory XV. If so, it was not among those which Pius VII. restored in 1815, for we have ascertained that it is not now at Heidelberg.

<sup>2</sup> Wichelhaus (*De N. T. Versione Syriaca*) tries to prove that the Cologne MS. of Rapheleng was not that used by de la Boderie. But Dr. Land's express statement (above, p. 273, n.) places it beyond doubt that the MS. now at Leiden is, as Marsh supposed, the one used by both editors. Rapheleng no doubt collected into his Appendix such readings of the MS. as he judged to be worth recording, though de la Boderie had not thought fit to admit them into his text.

variations of text, which by this time had become somewhat numerous.

The seventeenth century, farther on, added to Biblical literature (not to speak of minor editions) the two famous contributions already referred to, the great rival Polyglots of Paris and London. The former (1633) exhibited (*inter alia*) the whole Peshitto Old Testament (then first printed) except a few of the Apocryphal books; and it was the first issue of the entire New Testament, for it supplemented the Peshitto with the Four Minor Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse from later versions. These portions had been separately edited a few years before—the Apocalypse in 1627 by De Dieu from a Leiden MS., the Four Epistles in 1630 from one in the Bodleian, both of which were recent transcripts. The Paris editor of the Syriac text, Gabriel Sionita, a Maronite, has been blamed for incorporating this extraneous matter with the Syriac Vulgate; but unreasonably as it seems. His business was not to edit the Peshitto merely, but to produce as nearly as possible a complete Bible in Syriac. In combining, as he did, versions by different hands and of different ages, he has the example of the Greek-speaking Churches, which from the second or third century have included Theodotion's version of Daniel in the Septuagint; and he has been followed in this by all succeeding editors. That such combination was not repugnant to the mind of the Syrian Church has of late been proved by Syriac MSS., few, but of considerable antiquity, which have come to light, in which these Epistles are included with those of the Peshitto canon, either subjoined to them (as in the Cambridge MS., Oo I. 1, 2) or inserted in the usual Greek order in which Sionita has given them (as in a MS. of the Syriac New Testament in the possession of the Earl of Crawford). Sionita has amended somewhat the very faulty texts of these portions as printed by Pococke and De Dieu from their indifferent MSS., possibly from conjecture, but more probably by the use of independent copies. But concerning the preparation of this magnificent edition we have but little information; enough, however, as regards the part taken in it by Sionita, to show that, however well qualified in point of Syriac learning, he was as regards personal character and trustworthiness even less satisfactory than Moses of Mardin. Syriac scholars, however, will gladly forget his misdoings, and prefer to remember him only with gratitude as the first editor to give the sacred text with its complete apparatus of vowel and other points, which his successors have for the most part adopted from him.

Of  
kn  
lea  
Th  
of  
an  
(to  
giv  
Te  
by  
Pes  
Ha  
ver  
fou  
Ba  
in S  
one  
into  
Wa  
rest  
tion  
feat  
Lee  
bee  
one  
com  
men  
acco

the  
Wh  
the  
bee

and  
Syr  
vers  
that  
His  
ever  
the  
St. I  
the  
fully  
held

Of Walton's Polyglot it is needless to treat. It is too well known to need description, and its history may be readily learned from the biographies of Walton and of Ussher. Though not equal to its superb predecessor in the externals of form, it is better arranged, much less unwieldy to handle, and in many important respects more complete—containing (to speak of its Syriac part only) the Apocryphal books not given in the Paris edition, and finally completing the New Testament by admitting, on the authority of a MS. obtained by Ussher from the East, the *Pericope de Adultera* (which the Peshitto and even the seventh-century Syriac of Thomas of Harkel omit, in common with the best Greek MSS. and most versions), in a version which has since been found in three or four other MSS. Only one of these, however (the *Codex Barsabæus*, of New College, Oxford), inserts it in its place in St. John's Gospel. Two of them have a note ascribing it to one Paul—no doubt Paul of Tella, the translator of the LXX. into Syriac, who was a *collaborateur* of Thomas of Harkel. Walton's Syriac editor (Thorndike) has been content, for the rest, to reprint the Paris text, and to append a small collection of various readings. Subsequent editions present no features of note; their editors, except Drs. Buchanan and Lee and Dr. Perkins, as above stated, have for the most part been content to reprint with small variations the work of some one or other of their predecessors. Of these editions the most complete and useful on the whole is that of Schaaf, already mentioned; and the excellent *Lexicon Concordantie* which accompanies it has never yet been superseded.

From this survey of the history of the printed editions of the Syriac New Testament, the question naturally arises, What is the value of this version? What are the grounds of the interest it has excited? Is it worth the labour that has been expended on it?

There is no doubt that in the eyes of Teseo Ambrogio and of Widmanstadt, and of many other early students of Syriac, the Peshitto was invested with a glory above all other versions—if not above the sacred original—through the idea that its language was that in which Christ spoke, in which His Apostles first preached His word. Widmanstadt was even carried so far by this imagination as to believe that, in the case of two books of the New Testament—the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews—the Syriac was the actual original. But it is due to him to acknowledge fully that, over and above this consideration, he distinctly held in view, and urged on his royal master, as the prime end



to be aimed at in multiplying the Syriac Scriptures by means of the press, the enlightenment and elevation of the Churches of the East, into whose degraded state (if he was previously ignorant of it) he must have gained some insight from his dealings with the Jacobite legate. We may doubt whether the language of the Peshitto is so completely identical with the vernacular of Palestine of the Christian era as he supposed; none of us nowadays imagines, as he did, that the first Gospel in the Syriac New Testament came direct from St. Matthew's pen, or that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not write in Greek. But Widmanstadt's belief in the written Gospel of Christ as the best remedy for the errors and disorders, the ignorance and the sin that prevail in Christendom, commands our assent; and the energy with which he acted on that belief draws to him our sympathy and respect. Apparently the Roman court looked coldly on his work—on the version alleged to be older than the Roman Vulgate, composed in a language for which sanctity was claimed on a ground higher than could be asserted for the Latin; and it may be that he had incurred some share in the displeasure with which more than one Pope regarded Ferdinand.<sup>1</sup> Yet Widmanstadt was a devout Roman Catholic, and undoubtedly believed that the new life he hoped to be instrumental in imparting to the Syrian Churches would draw them into reunion with Rome.<sup>2</sup> The scholars of the Reformation, on

<sup>1</sup> Johannes Wolfius (*Lectionum memorabilium Centenarii XVI.*, a book full of absurd and superstitious stories, printed in 1600) makes, *s. a.* 1564, a ridiculous statement on the authority of P. P. Vergerio (Bishop of Capo d'Istria, who became a Lutheran and a vehement anti-Romish controversialist), in his third *Dialogus de Osio*, pp. 202 ff., to the effect that the Pope was displeased at Ferdinand for sending the printed copies to the East, and 'suborned one Lucretius to corrupt it' [presumably by assimilating its text to that of the Vulgate]. Even Ussher (*Hist. Dogm., ut infr.*) has stooped to adopt this idle slander. It rests (be it observed) on the blunder above noticed (p. 276, *n.* 1) of making Lucretius a distinct person from Widmanstadt, whom Ussher has just before justly described as the learned person to whom the work was due. Moreover, Wolfius misreports Vergerio, who does not state that the Pope interfered with the publication, but merely that 'multi prudentes viri suspicabantur ne quid monstri aleretur, praesertim cum Jo. Lucretius a Widman editioni praesesset.' The blunder as to Lucretius originated evidently with Wolfius.—The over-hastiness of controversialists to doubt the good faith of Widmanstadt is further shown by the suspicion cast by Vergerio, on the authority (as he alleges) of Moses of Mardin, upon the Lesson-Tables subjoined to the *Editio Princeps*, which he supposes to be forged by the editor to support the authority of the Roman Calendar, &c. It is well known that similar Tables have since come to light in Syriac N. T. MSS. of high antiquity.

<sup>2</sup> The chief end for which he laboured to promote the study of the Oriental versions was (in his own words) 'ad innumerabiles Asiae Africaeque populos in Catholicæ ecclesiæ ditionem redigendos.'



the other side, welcomed the Peshitto for the very reasons which had set the Roman authorities against it, and expected from the study of it results widely different from those which Widmanstadt had in view, as regards the claims of Rome to supremacy. Its uses in the theological questions of the day were at once perceived; and the example of a vernacular version current in the Syrian Churches was promptly caught up as a weapon against the papal refusal to give the Scriptures to the people in a tongue they understood.

We find this argument suggested (apparently for the first time) by Tremellius, who in his *Dedication* informs Queen Elizabeth how 'the Antiochian Patriarch sent' to Europe to get the Syriac New Testament printed, 'because in his Churches they use not the Latin language, but that which is understood in those parts, namely the Syriac;' and it is quoted from him and adopted by Ussher in his *Historia Dogmatica* (c. viii. s. i. p. 416). The latter great scholar, in his early *Prælectiones Theologicæ* (*Cath. Assertio Integr. Fontium V. et N. Instr.* c. ii.—*Works*, t. xiv. pp. 222, 223, written in 1610), appeals also to this version in his disputation against Bellarmine and the Council of Trent concerning the sole authority claimed for the Latin Vulgate. And he not only repeats the account which ascribes the Peshitto to St. Mark, quoting with approval the saying of Francis Lucas of Bruges (a Romish writer), that 'the Syriac text of the New Testament is to be reckoned and revered as equivalent to a very ancient Greek copy of the first authority,' but even goes so far as to lay down that this version 'agrees with the Greek copies in *all* the places where they differ from the Latin, even those places which the Papists suspect as corrupted by errors due to time or to malpractices of the transcribers'—a proposition which a subsequent part of his own work (pp. 237 ff.) proves to be questionable, as the able Romish writer whom he quotes had already by anticipation shown it to be untenable.<sup>1</sup> It is probable, therefore, that one motive which

<sup>1</sup> Lucas Brugensis (*In SS. Evangg. Commentar.*, 1606) appears to have been the first commentator on the New Testament to use the Syriac version purely for critical and exegetical ends. He records its readings regularly and with fairness, noting their agreement now with the Greek, now with the Latin text. In his *Prolegomena*, immediately before the words quoted by Ussher, he writes, 'ex Syriaca editione non parum lucis accedit, nec minus Latinus quam Græcus textus defensionis accipit.' If Ussher had noted this sentence, and examined the commentary, he would have avoided the misstatement above pointed out. On the Protestant side, Ludovic de Dieu of Leiden deserves honourable mention for the thorough and honest use made by him of the Syriac and other versions

actuated him and other scholars of his time and school in the study of this and other ancient versions of the Scriptures, was controversial. Their Romish opponents, however, were not slow to detect the weak points of the case as presented by the Protestants. They had no difficulty in proving that the antiquity claimed for the Peshitto was excessive, and they pointed to the fact that the Syriac had long ceased to be vernacular in Syria; so that though in the Syrian Churches Mass was said and the Scriptures were read in Syriac, that language was less commonly understood, even by ecclesiastics, than Latin in Italy, or indeed in any part of Europe where education was at all extensively diffused. The retort was good as against Tremellius, but by no means against Ussher; for the argument as presented by him was grounded on the usage of the Syrian Churches not of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, but of the earlier days when their version of the Scriptures was made and their Liturgies were composed, in the tongue which was then the vernacular. In Walton's *Prolegomena* (xiii.) we find (s. 19) a distinct recognition of the position of the Syriac as a language no longer current except in ecclesiastical use; and in an earlier section (16) the writer abates somewhat of the claim made on its behalf by his predecessors in respect of primitive antiquity and of complete fidelity to the Greek. As time went on, both sides apparently began to feel that they had pushed their arguments too far, and it came to be generally recognized among scholars of either party that the Peshitto, though neither apostolic as regards its date nor perfect in point of accuracy, yet was, if not superior, certainly not inferior to any other existing version, alike in value and in age.

But as the controversial use of this version declined, the interest taken in it by theologians appears to have declined accordingly, and hence probably ensued the decrease—almost cessation—in the production of editions of it which, as we have already shown, marks the Biblical literature of the eighteenth century. It is noteworthy that the revival of activity in reissuing the Syriac Scriptures, which we have already spoken of as having manifested itself in England in the earlier years of the present century, and more recently in America, is due to the same impulse which moved Widmanstadt to produce the *Editio Princeps*—the design to benefit the Eastern Churches by multiplying for their use, by means of the printing-press, copies of their national version. The managers of the Bible in his *Animadversiones in IV. Evangg.* (Leiden, 1631), and *Animadvv. in Acta App.* (ib. 1634).

Societies of England and America, though well aware that the Biblical Syriac has long ceased to be spoken in the East (except perhaps in a few remote spots), have rightly judged that to print the Scriptures in that tongue for the clergy and all who can read it even as a dead language, is to give them access to an inestimable treasure. The American edition of Urumiah, we may add, gives side by side with the text a version into the Neo-Syriac current among the Christians of the country where it was printed. But, apart from this benevolent purpose, another cause has served powerfully to re-awaken Biblical scholars to the importance of the Syriac version, and the duty of studying the language in which it is written—an increased sense, namely, of its critical and exegetical value. All competent judges admit that the Peshitto comes near to being the model of what a version ought to be—faithful without servility, free and idiomatic, while never relaxing into paraphrase. Its authors, over and above the gifts of good judgment and skill, have had the happy fortune to work in a language which, Semitic by family, has acquired not a little of the flexibility, and something even of the logical expressiveness, of the best Aryan tongues. They have thus been enabled not only to reproduce the Hebrew Scriptures and those parts of the New Testament which have a Hebraic colouring, with almost the force and grandeur of the original, but further they have had an advantage above all the other translators of the New Testament, regarded as a collection of Greek books written by authors of Semitic speech and nationality. The notion that the Peshitto incorporates the originals of St. Matthew's Gospel and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as we have already said, has long vanished from the minds of scholars; and probably all are agreed that a similar claim advanced recently by Dr. Cureton on behalf of the version of the First Gospel contained in the recension known as Curetonian, is equally illusory. But we may fairly affirm of the Peshitto New Testament that it frequently casts light on obscure expressions of the original; nay, more, that in not a few places its Aramaic idiom does fuller justice than the Greek to the expression of the ideas, feelings, and recollections of men who thought in Aramaic what they wrote in Greek.<sup>1</sup> For their Aramaic, if not absolutely identical with that of this version, was closely akin, and differed from it

<sup>1</sup> 'Sancti viri Syriace conceperunt quæ Græce scripserunt . . . Cum ipsi N. T. scriptores hac lingua sibi vernacula primum Judæis . . . cælestia oracula promulgârint, et postea Græco idiomate scripserint, Syriasmî tamen gustum ubique retinent' (Walton, *Prolegg. ut supra*).

only dialectically; while their Greek was to all of them an acquired language, and to some of them probably an instrument not sufficiently familiar to ensure the adequate utterance of that which the Spirit that was in them moved them to write. Anyone who has acquired sufficient Syriac to read the Peshitto New Testament, may justly feel that in using it he is brought nearer than before to the mind of the sacred writers, and will seem to hear in it their thoughts rendered back into the language in which they were first conceived, and their record of the sayings of the Lord Himself reproduced in the very words in which He spoke them.

As regards the critical use, however, of the Peshitto, there is room for difference of opinion among scholars, resulting from differing estimates of its antiquity. No one now claims for it that it is of the Apostolic times, nor on the other hand does anyone adopt the extreme under-estimate of its age to which Romish disputants were formerly inclined, and which (on different grounds) Wetstein afterwards pushed so far as to assign it to the seventh century. The question as to its date, which was in earlier days one of polemic divinity, has in these latter times an interest rather for the Biblical critic than for the theological controversialist. The dispute in which this version is cited as evidence is no longer that concerning the comparative authority of the Greek and the Latin; it is that between those who uphold and those who impugn the incorruptness of the Greek as commonly received and known as the *Textus Receptus*. It has long been known that the agreement of the Syriac with that text is neither complete nor uniform, but that on the contrary it frequently sides with the Latin against the 'received' Greek—which of course is the Greek which Protestant divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had in view. Now, however, that modern criticism has taken in hand to reconstruct the Greek text on the basis of the oldest extant MSS., the antiquity of the Peshitto, as a version which to a considerable though limited extent supports the Received Text, is once more sharply questioned. The critics who regard that text as the result of a revision or revisions made in the third or fourth century, by which the primitive text was largely modified, find themselves compelled to date the Peshitto (in its present form) not earlier than the first of these revisions, and to accept the recension known as the Curetonian as the true representative of the original Syriac version of the New Testament, bearing to it the same relation as the Old Latin to the Hieronymian Vulgate.

This is not the occasion—nor have we left ourselves space

18  
ce  
th  
so  
ar  
to  
th  
Gr  
ag  
in  
is  
fro  
can  
of  
to  
the  
Af  
the  
wh  
crit  
low  
in  
poli  
the  
that  
inde  
test  
or t  
  
of th  
Mr.  
in th  
is al  
(Ren  
more  
near  
bear  
as p  
stant  
unde  
centu  
and r  
tonia  
beggi  
appro

—to enter into the controversy we have thus touched on concerning the primitive Greek text, nor to discuss the claims of the Curetonian text to be accepted as the *Syriaca Vetus* (a title somewhat prematurely bestowed on it by recent writers). We are content to note the importance added by these questions to the study of the Peshitto, and to enter our protest against the tendency, apparent among critics who are opposed to the Greek *Textus Receptus*, to prejudge the case respecting the age and character of the Peshitto, holding themselves justified in disparaging its authority beforehand, on the ground that it is based on a Greek text of a type which differed considerably from that which has its chief representative in the *Codex Vaticanus*. In truth the Peshitto has met with more than its share of unfair handling. At first, Romish controversialists refused to credit it with antiquity because it agreed too closely with the Greek (corrupted as they alleged) against the Latin. Afterwards, Wetstein set it down as a 'Latinized' work of the seventh century, because he found in it too many places where it supported the Latin against the Greek. Our modern critics as unreasonably, though less extravagantly, strive to lower its date because it is too often an inconvenient witness in favour of the common text ('Syrian' or 'Constantinopolitan'), and thus stands in the way of the restoration of the hypothetical primitive text. We claim for the Peshitto that its age shall be investigated and its value appraised on independent grounds of internal evidence and of external testimony, and not with a sidelong view to the support of this or that theory of Greek textual criticism.

We welcome the announcement of a really critical edition of the Syriac Gospels, such as we expect to be produced by Mr. Gwilliam, as the promise of the first and essential move in the direction of the investigation we indicate. Already he is able to assure us that Dr. Cureton was mistaken in stating (*Remains of a very Antient Recension*, pref. p. lxxiii) that 'the more antient the MSS. [of the Syriac Gospels] be the more nearly do they correspond with the text' (of the version which bears his name); but that on the contrary the Peshitto text as printed by Widmanstadt and subsequent editors is substantially the same—without a trace of any older text underlying it—as the text preserved in MSS. of fourteen centuries ago, MSS. probably as old as the *Codex Alexandrinus*, certainly as old as the MS. which exhibits the Curetonian version. We protest, further, against the question-begging title of the '*Old Syriac*' which of late years has been appropriated to the Curetonian by the critics whose theories

of the Greek text require the assumption that the Peshitto in its present form is the result of a third or fourth century recension. No external evidence has been adduced to prove that any such recension ever took place; and the sole reason for the supposition is the analogy of the 'Old Latin' and its relation to the Vulgate. But in matters of fact analogy is an unsafe guide; and, besides, the parallelism between the cases of the Syriac and the Latin Vulgate is a very imperfect one. The priority in date of the Old Latin version (or versions) to the Vulgate of Jerome, the fact that the former is the basis of the latter, the particulars of time, place, and authorship of the revision, are matters of historic certainty: as regards the two Syriac versions which are supposed to correspond to these, we have no history—all is hypothesis. The Curetonian Syriac no doubt follows in the main that ancient type of text to which the Old Latin belongs, usually known as 'Western'; but it is obvious that a version founded on a very ancient text may be itself comparatively recent. And that the abundance of 'Western' readings exhibited by it is no proof of its primitive antiquity appears from the fact that 'Western' readings prevail likewise in the Harkleian recension<sup>1</sup> which is known to have been made so late as the year 616. We admit, however, that the Curetonian is a very ancient version, and we hardly think it worth while to notice the extravagant notion of the Abbé Martin, who holds it to be a translation made about the middle of the seventh century by Jacob of Edessa at Alexandria, from the *Codex Bezae*!<sup>2</sup> We have satisfied

<sup>1</sup> See Adler, *Novi Testamenti Verss. Syr.* lib. ii. pp. 130-34; where it is shown that of about 180 readings given on the Harkleian margin (which he assumes to be gathered by Thomas from his Alexandrian MSS.) no less than 110 agree with *Cod. Bezae* (the 'Western' *Codex par excellence*) besides seven which are found in the Latin but not in any Greek copy.

<sup>2</sup> *Introd. à la Critique du N. T.* (1883), pp. 230-33. This idea may have been suggested to the Abbé by Wetstein's similar opinion that *Codex Bezae* had been one of the MSS. used by Thomas of Harkel. For this judgment as to the age of the MS., see p. 196. Our sense of the value of this learned and industrious work would induce us to pass over in silence the absurdity of the *Post Scriptum* by which (pp. 234-36) the author has thought it seemly to embellish his argument, were it not that in a subsequent volume of the same *Partie Pratique*, t. iv. 1885-6) he has followed it up by a still more outrageous fiction—placed as an introduction to the second section (pp. 178-189), a marvel of indecorum and bad taste, after the very worst manner of M. Max O'Rell. If it occurred in one of the books of that popular writer it might not seem out of place, and we could simply put it aside and leave it unread, as it deserves to be; but, standing as it does as part of a treatise on a subject so sacred, it is in the highest degree offensive, and to be reprobated.



ourselves by personal inspection that Dr. Cureton, however he may have overrated the value and age of the version discovered by him, did not in any great degree, if at all, overrate the age of the MS. (Br. Mus., Add. 14451) in which that version is preserved; but that he was right in assuming for it a date not later than the fifth century, probably in the middle of it—a century and a half before Jacob of Edessa was born! But we do not regard it as proved that this version ever was current, or is anything more than the work of a reviser of the fourth or fifth century, remodelling the Peshitto partly by the aid of a Greek MS. of 'Western' text, partly after his own ideas of propriety of translation and diction.

We have not left ourselves room to touch on the Syriac text of the portions of the New Testament which, not being in the Peshitto canon (though they have been supplied in all the later printed editions from 1633), do not come within the scope of Mr. Gwilliam's undertaking. We merely note the fact that the printed text of each part of these *Antilegomena* is based mainly, if not entirely, on a single MS. of unsatisfactory character and recent date, and therefore stands in need of critical revision. And we are glad to learn that, as regards the Four Minor Catholic Epistles, such a revision has been to some extent carried out by Professor Isaac H. Hall, in the New York edition now before us, with the aid of an excellent fifteenth-century MS. in the possession of Mr. R. S. Williams of Utica, New York. Many still older Syriac copies of these Epistles are now accessible in the British Museum and elsewhere; and a reconstruction of their text and also (so far as materials can be found) of that of the Syriac Apocalypse, is much to be desired.

In conclusion, we would urge on Mr. Gwilliam and on the Delegates of the Clarendon Press the desirability of extending the usefulness of their important undertaking so as to bring its results within the reach of Biblical students unacquainted with Syriac, by annexing to it a literal translation—after the example of so many of the more important editions, from Tremellius's to Schaaf's. Whether the translation should be, as in those editions, a Latin one, is a question to be carefully considered. Dr. Etheridge's translation of the entire New Testament from Syriac into English is a useful work, and Dr. Cureton employed English in the rendering subjoined by him to his text. But the attempt made with considerable success by Baethgen to restore the Greek whence that version was rendered, and the earlier one of Skat-Rördam to perform the easier task of recovering Origen's Septuagintal

text of the Book of Judges from the Syro-Hexapla, prompt the suggestion that the most serviceable accompaniment to the revised Peshitto would be a Greek text representing as closely as possible the Greek original of the Peshitto. For, after all, the object for which Biblical students refer to the Peshitto is mainly to obtain an answer to the question, What text must the Syriac translator have had before him? And to give this answer through the medium of a Latin version, which the reader has to render mentally into Greek for himself, is surely a roundabout proceeding; and, what is more serious, it is a proceeding which brings in two elements of possible error—the risk that the translator may have failed in conveying distinctly in Latin the Greek which he supposes to underlie the Syriac; and the risk that the reader may go wrong in his mental rendering of the Latin into Greek. No one who has consulted the Latin which stands beside the Syriac in the Polyglots, or in Schaaf, can have failed to find himself in danger of mistakes arising from both these causes. A Greek text such as we suggest would not only be free from these sources of misunderstanding, but it would further have this great advantage, that it would be disencumbered of the mere reproductions of Syriac idioms which disfigure the versions, Latin and English, to which we have referred. On these grounds we would express our hope that the forthcoming edition of the Peshitto Gospels may, by the addition of this new feature, be made to surpass its predecessors in usefulness to all students of the Greek text as much as, by its *apparatus criticus* and the collations therein embodied, it will undoubtedly excel them in the accuracy of its text.

---

## ART. II.—ANCIENT AND MODERN CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

- 1 *The Growth of Church Institutions.* By the Rev. EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. (London, 1887.)
- 2 *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* By EDWIN HATCH, M.A. Second edition, revised. (The *Bampton Lectures* for 1880.) (London, 1882.)
- 3 *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. (Oxford, 1882.)
- 4 *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.* By W. M. RAMSAY. (In vol. iv. of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.) (London, 1883.)
- 5 *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des Römischen Reichs.* Von Dr. EMIL KUHN. (Leipzig, 1865.)

DR. HATCH'S new lectures, although they have suggested the present article, fall within our purview only so far as they are concerned with the primitive era of Christianity. With the really valuable part of the book—the account of the 'settlement,' if we may call it so, associated with the names of Boniface and Charles the Great, under which Christian institutions assumed for the most part their mediæval forms—we have nothing to do; but these chapters are prefaced by some which seem to us to build on the unsound foundation of radically false conceptions of early Christian history. The first two chapters and the seventh purport to trace the origins of the diocese, the diocesan bishop, and the metropolitan. They postulate the existence of the episcopal office, and concern themselves with the application of episcopacy to territorial organizations; and since, in a former number of this Review,<sup>1</sup> we had ourselves traced the genesis of the episcopate in relation to the ministry of the Church, and thus arrived at the point at which Dr. Hatch, in the work immediately before us, takes his start, it may perhaps not prove unacceptable to our readers if we proceed with Dr. Hatch to the further investigation of the bishop in relation to the diocese.

It would not, indeed, be just to judge Dr. Hatch solely by the present lectures on the *Growth of Church Institutions*, for

<sup>1</sup> *C.Q.R.* for April 1887, pp. 115-44.

his *Bampton Lectures* (which we have also named at the head of this article), with all the faults of the text, with all the one-sidedness of the treatment of evidence, the indefensible deductions, the impossible hypotheses, are, at least as far as the notes go, a veritable monument of patient labour and recondite information; and we doubt whether justice has been done by his opponents to this side of his book. But we cannot help thinking that the Reader in Ecclesiastical History might have found better things to do than to reprint a series of articles from a monthly magazine in a shape which perpetuates one of the worst faults of which an historian can be guilty, that of putting forward new views without any attempt even to give references to the facts which form his authorities for them. It is a thing irritating in the extreme even in a Mommsen; in any lesser writer it is unpardonable.

Dr. Hatch's method may be fairly described as the search for differences. His conception of the duty of an historian is satisfied when he has called attention to an external divergence between the ecclesiastical institutions of the first century and of the nineteenth, and it never seems to occur to him that substantial identity of principle can survive much apparent change, or that it is a very shallow criticism which shuts its eyes upon essential unities and opens them only to detect microscopic variations.

'The justification of the existence of differences is to be found in the nature of Christianity itself. It was designed to be at once universal and permanent, to embrace all races of mankind, and to meet the needs of successive ages. The presumption is that, this being so, it was also designed to adapt its outward forms to the inevitable changes of human society, and that its earliest institutions were meant to be modified.'<sup>1</sup>

'The diocesan system, as it now exists, is the effect of a series of historical circumstances. It is impossible to defend every part of it as being primitive, nor is it necessary to do so. It is sufficient to show that it is the result of successive re-adaptations of the Church's framework to the needs of the times.'<sup>2</sup>

'All groupings are artificial. The measure of the Divine will is the spiritual good that comes of grouping. . . . The great mediæval institution of national Churches claims our respect as an instrument of spiritual good in the past, and the particular Church to which we belong claims also our allegiance as the instrument with which God has appointed us to work in the present; but the sacredness of the institution attaches not so much to the fact of its existence as to the spirit which prompts its members, nor can it be shown that any blessing rests upon it which does not also rest upon all congrega-

<sup>1</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 18.

tions of two or three who are gathered together in the name of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

We note, however, two concessions, which, so far as our task is polemical, will materially lighten it. Dr. Hatch accepts explicitly the substantial similarity of the existing Church organization with the forms which emerged in the eighth and ninth centuries from the reconstruction of the ruins of the Western Empire. 'The main features of the new system have been so strongly marked on the face of Christendom for more than eleven hundred years as to make it difficult for most persons to conceive of a time when they did not exist.' Modern diocesan episcopacy

'grew up in the Frankish domain under the legislation of the Frankish princes and kings, by the co-operation of Church and State, at the instigation in the first instance of the great missionary Boniface.'<sup>2</sup>

'To him more than to any other single cause the main features of the ecclesiastical system of the West are due; and from the lines of diocesan episcopacy which he laid down there was not until the Reformation any considerable departure.'<sup>3</sup>

More significant still is the second admission, contained in words which immediately follow the last quotation. 'Those lines were in the main the revival of some elements of the Eastern system, which is found in its most perfect form in the canons of Chalcedon.' Quite similarly the institution of metropolitans under Charles the Great is called 'the revived system' and 'the re-establishment.' It is not too much to say that in these unwary phrases Dr. Hatch has succeeded in making mince-meat of two-thirds of his own arguments. If the outlines of the 'new system' have 'again and again been treated as part of the essence of Christian organization, and departures from them have been treated as violations of Apostolic order,' the justification of the action deprecated lies simply in the admission made that the system was not 'new' at all. The kernel of the controversy will be found, not in the relation of the eighth-century arrangements to the previously existing condition of things in the West, but in the relation of the fourth-century system to primitive times. The centuries of the barbarian invasions are wholly and completely out of account. It does not affect the issue in the slightest that an ever-increasing degradation had left the Church without organization, without discipline, and without doctrine, if the reformation which succeeded bridged the chasm and esta-

<sup>1</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 29.

blished the continuity of the later development of the West with the earlier development of the East.

This first step in our proof—the general identity of the principles of the diocesan or territorial organization of our own day with those of the period of the four great Councils—is, however, far too momentous to be based only on a possibly not well-considered admission of our author. We shall therefore proceed to lay down what seem to be the decisive elements in this particular sphere of our own Church polity, and then investigate their position in the Church of fifteen centuries ago. Nor do we anticipate any objection, if, assuming (as we have said) episcopacy, we define as follows the factors of our own episcopal organization: firstly, the bishop is unique in his own sphere; secondly, his sphere is diocesan, not congregational; thirdly, the various dioceses are federated, not isolated; fourthly, just as the diocese is based ordinarily on civil lines, so the federation of dioceses is ultimately coextensive with the nation.

I. That there cannot now be two bishops of the same see or jurisdiction, is obvious. There cannot be more than one Bishop of Durham, and no discontented faction under him could set up another with valid claims to recognition by the federation, until the one already in possession was ousted. It is, in fact, the episcopal organization of the Church, not the voluntary act of each individual Churchman, which guarantees a Bishop's authority. In practice we may even go further and say that, although there could be, there are never likely to be two bishops in the same city, even with different jurisdictions. London is the only case in which such a proposal could be possibly made, and there is an instinctive feeling among Churchmen that the true way to meet the existing difficulty is by the multiplication of suffragans rather than by the division of the diocese.

II. There will be, we conceive, as little hesitation in according assent to our next proposition. The bishop of Truro, for instance, is not simply president of the congregation or congregations (conceived of as one) that meet in Truro; not only Truro but all the parishes that make up the county of Cornwall form a *territory* or diocese, a group of congregations, under his sole control.

III. But the individual dioceses do not stand, and have never stood, alone. In the original scheme of Gregory the Great for the conversion of England, provision was made for grouping the dioceses into two provinces, under the metropolitan authority respectively of London and York. With



the substitution of Canterbury for London, this scheme, or something like it, was put into force at the end of the seventh century, and if the boundaries between the two provinces have varied somewhat, the provincial organization itself has proved permanent, and is perpetuated in the two Convocations.

IV. This division into provinces was possibly rather arbitrary and artificial in its origin, although at present it represents with singular fidelity the distinction of 'the North' from the rest of England. But very early—earlier, indeed, than the division into provinces—came the consolidation of all the English dioceses into one organically united English Church. Itself the creation, one may almost say, of the illustrious Primate, Theodore of Tarsus, the National Church of England was anterior to, and, indeed, was conducive to, the formation of the National State. Nor has the provincial system ever so far tended to interfere with the national basis of the Church, that there has ever been any danger that there would be two Churches of Canterbury and York, and not one Church of England.

Not only, however, the federation, but the individual dioceses, have been formed ordinarily on civil lines. The early English dioceses were coincident with the early English kingdoms, and some even preserve the identity to this day. The diocese of Chichester is the kingdom of the South Saxons. It is true that in most cases later changes in the political as well as in the ecclesiastical geography have obscured the original resemblance; but the newer dioceses have borne, wherever practicable, the same relation to the modern political units of the counties that their predecessors did to the kingdoms. The changes of the past twelve years have made Exeter, Truro, Chester, Durham, Newcastle, and Lincoln, shire dioceses. The changes of the remaining years of the century may, it is to be hoped, do the same for Surrey and Hants, Norfolk and Suffolk, Essex, and yet other counties.

So much for our own times. We do not conceive that there can be any serious quarrel against the contention that these same principles were, allowing for minor differences produced by different and to a certain degree divergent conditions, the acting principles of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. But in any case, from the point of view of our further inquiry, it will be needful to draw out the ecclesiastical organization of that period at some, but not, we hope, excessive, length. Our appeal will be, wherever possible, to

the Councils whose canons still form the *corpus juris* of the Eastern Church.<sup>1</sup>

I., II. Words need not be wasted to prove what no one would dream of denying that in the fourth century the rule, one bishop only in each city, was absolute. We are not so sure that we should carry Dr. Hatch with us at once to concede the territorial or diocesan character of the whole episcopate in that period. But whatever may have been the earlier conception of a bishopric, the canons of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341) prove to demonstration that the sphere of a bishop's action was not confined to his 'city' (*πόλις*), but embraced the 'country,' or 'countries' (*χωραι*), surrounding and depending upon it. 'Every bishop has authority over his own diocese, and must . . . take charge of the whole region surrounding his episcopal city' (Canon 9). Chorepiscopi, or country bishops, may not ordain a priest or deacon 'without the bishop of the city to which the chorepiscopus himself and the whole district are subject' (Canon 10).

III. We have still to place side by side with our modern organization the federation of dioceses into one intricate whole, such as we find in progress in the earliest years of the fourth century, and completed by the middle of the fifth. And since there are, unfortunately, several points here on which it will be incumbent on us to join issue with Dr. Hatch, we shall do best first to state our own conception of the successive stages in the development of the complex machinery by which dioceses were grouped into provinces, and provinces were grouped into 'exarchates,' and 'exarchates' were partially grouped into, partially superseded by, patriarchates; and then to examine any views put forward by Dr. Hatch contrary to the results at which we may have arrived. We shall distinguish, then, three steps, marked respectively, the

<sup>1</sup> While not overlooking the essential distinction between East and West (on which Dr. Hatch lays stress, *Church Inst.* p. 31), we hold ourselves justified by the undermentioned considerations in confining ourselves in the main to the history of the Eastern Church. (1) As Christianity took its rise in the East, overspread the East before it came into contact with the West, and was supreme in the East at a time when it was still in hand-to-hand conflict with Paganism in the West, it follows that at any given moment in the first five centuries the organization of the Christian Church in the East represents a point far in advance of the contemporary condition in the West. (2) We possess the invaluable, because authoritative, information of half-a-dozen great Eastern Councils during the period. (3) It is through the Eastern Church, as we have pointed out, that Dr. Hatch himself admits that whatever connexion our own or the eighth-century organization may boast with primitive antiquity is derived.

first by the Councils of Nicæa (A.D. 325) and Antioch (A.D. 341), the next by the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), and the final by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451).

In the canons of Nicæa and Antioch the only feature yet universally prominent is the grouping of dioceses into provinces under metropolitans. 'A bishop ought to be appointed if possible by all the bishops in the province; but . . . in any case by the agreement of three . . . and the ratification of the result belongs in each province to the metropolitan' (Nicæa, Canon 4). 'And generally, this is clear that if anyone be made a bishop without the assent of the metropolitan, the great synod has laid down that he ought not to be a bishop' (*ib.* Canon 6). Still more definitely the Council of Antioch: 'The bishops of every province must be aware that the bishop presiding in the metropolis has charge of the whole province . . . and that without him the other bishops should *according to the ancient and recognized canon of our fathers* do nothing beyond what concerns their respective dioceses' (Antioch, Canon 9).

There is, however, one other special phenomenon in the ecclesiastical federation of these earlier Councils which, in view of later developments, cannot pass without notice. Side by side with the normal privileges of every metropolitan, the Nicene Council names the three cities of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch (in a descending scale), in connexion with superior prerogatives (Nicæa, Canon 6).

So much of the system as meets us in a developed form at the beginning of the fourth century must have existed in germ far back into the primitive age. It is otherwise when the gulf is spanned which separates the first Œcumenical Council from the second. At the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) two new factors claim recognition. Ranking among the three great Churches of whom the Nicene canon made mention appears a fourth in the new capital of the Eastern Empire, the Church of Constantinople or New Rome, placed next after old Rome and above Alexandria and Antioch (Constantinople, Canon 3). But over and above the privileges of individual Churches, the general machinery of the federation had advanced a grade further in complexity. The Nicene grouping of dioceses into a province has been followed in the interval before Constantinople by the grouping of provinces into a *διοίκησις* or 'exarchate'; and the second canon of the later Council restrains the bishops of one 'diocese'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This use of 'diocese' as equivalent to exarchate must of course be carefully distinguished from our own use of diocese as a single bishop's territory, which the canons regularly express by *παροικία*. For the 'diocese'

from interfering with the bishops of another. All the five Eastern 'dioceses' are mentioned in the canon—Egypt, the East, Asia, Pontus, and Thrace—but it is worth noting that this organization is still so far rudimentary that the 'dioceses' are mentioned without the bishops of their capitals, the 'exarchs'; the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch occur by name, as at Nicæa, but the Exarchs of Heraclea (Thrace), Ephesus (Asia), and Cappadocian Cæsarea (Pontus) are still absent.

It is not till the third and final stage of the development in the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) that we meet with the Exarch as a regular tribunal of appeal in cases of controversy with a metropolitan (Chalcedon, Canons 9, 17). But by this time a further and in some ways a novel tendency was at work. The organization into Exarchates was in course of being superseded by an organization into Patriarchates. Just as Rome had been consolidating her authority over the entire West, so the Bishops of Constantinople, and notably St. Chrysostom, had been extending their influence throughout their own neighbourhood until it was paramount in the three 'dioceses' of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia. At Chalcedon, 'the throne of royal Constantinople' became for these 'dioceses' an alternative tribunal of appeal with their proper exarchs (*ib.* Canons 9, 17), who themselves, as well as the metropolitans under them, were henceforth (according to the famous Canon 28), to be consecrated by the 'aforenamed most holy throne.' When we add to the aggrandizement of Rome and Constantinople the emancipation of Jerusalem, as recognized in the Acts of Chalcedon, not only from its subjection to the hitherto metropolitan see of Cæsarea (in Palestine) assumed in the seventh Nicene Canon, but even from the authority of the great Church of Antioch, we have the new patriarchal organization sketched to hand. All the Western 'dioceses' formed the Patriarchate of Rome; of the East, Thrace, Pontus and Asia went to make the Patriarchate of Constantinople; Egypt, the 'diocese' or exarchate of Alexandria, becomes with the same boundaries its Patriarchate; while the remaining 'diocese' of the East proper, hitherto owning only the sway of the Antiochene bishop, was divided into the two Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem. If finally we recall the substitution of the Patriarch of Moscow for the 'heretical' Patriarch of Rome, we have the outline of the Eastern Church system to this day.

see below; inverted commas will be used for the term when employed in this technical sense.

Before we can pass from this section of our subject, we have still to deal, as we promised, with certain statements made by Dr. Hatch. The whole idea of federation is apparently so repugnant to him that he seizes on any argument, and utilizes every opportunity, whether to minimize its extent or to deny its usefulness. With the latter, it is no business of ours to deal, but his criticisms on the prevalence of the system it will be well to meet.

In the first place, then, against the existence of Provincial Councils at the opening of the fourth century he alleges the Council of Ancyra (*c.* 314 A.D.?), the Acts of which 'are signed by thirteen bishops from various provinces of both Asia Minor and Syria.' But surely a glance at the subscriptions makes it plain that it was nothing less than a conference of representative bishops from a wide area, and in conception far nearer to a general Eastern Council than to an ordinary provincial synod.<sup>1</sup>

Not content with an individual instance, Dr. Hatch next asserts that the

'Nicene canons rather sketched an ideal than established a general practice . . . in some parts of the empire, certainly in North Africa,<sup>2</sup> and probably elsewhere, metropolitans were not recognized; and in the fifth century the Council of Chalcedon (Canon 19) based a new regulation upon the fact that the half-yearly meetings [*i.e.* the provincial synods of Nicæa, Canon 5] had ceased to be regularly held. It was not until the sixth century, and, as far as existing records enable us to judge, it was only in some parts of Western Europe, that the system attained anything like a complete development' (*Ch. Inst.* p. 123).

Really, could anything be more contrary to all we know of the fourth and fifth centuries than this hypothesis of the disappearance of metropolitans? They are mentioned in five canons of this very Council of Chalcedon (Canons 9, 12, 17, 19, 25) as against three only of Nicæa (Canons 4, 5, 6). And if some explanation must be given of the partial cessation of provincial councils, it would be due rather to the aggrandizement of metropolitans than to their insignificance. Just as the consecration of bishops-elect is spoken of at Nicæa (Canon 4) as the duty of any three bishops with the consent of the rest in writing, only the ratification remaining to the metropolitan, while at Chalcedon (Canon 25) it is attributed directly to the

<sup>1</sup> Nine out of the thirteen are, we fancy, metropolitans—the Bishops of Antioch in Syria, Ancyra, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Tarsus, Amasea, Nicomedia, Iconium, Antioch in Pisidia, Laodicea in Phrygia.

<sup>2</sup> What has Africa, which was Western, got to do with it?

metropolitan and to him alone, so it is probable that by the same time and in the same way the metropolitan had concentrated in his own person functions and business, such as in particular the right of hearing appeals, which should have been, according to the original legislation, reserved for the provincial synod. Also we need surely not remind Dr. Hatch that to the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) only the metropolitans were summoned and such able suffragans as they might select to accompany them.

Dr. Hatch's third argument against 'the assumption . . . that this confederation and no other is the Church of Christ in its visible and earthly form' is contained in his *Bampton Lectures* (p. 185). 'There is no proof,' he says, 'that the confederation was ever complete in the sense of embracing all the communities to which by common consent the name Christian was in the fullest sense applicable.' 'Some Churches remained independent. . . . Their bishops had no superior. They were what the *Notitiæ* or lists of orthodox Churches call *αὐτοκέφαλοι*. They were in the position which Cyprian had in earlier times asserted to be the true position of all bishops. Their responsibility was to God alone.'

Cyprus and Armenia are the instances given in support of this assertion. The case of Cyprus is of special interest to ourselves as Englishmen, because it has retained its 'autocephalic' character from the time of the Council of Ephesus down to the present day. But Dr. Hatch's phraseology seems to imply a forgetfulness of what is meant by the term. One would suppose he had overlooked the fact that, so far as the metropolitan system went, Cyprus was on exactly the same footing as any other province, its bishops being subject to the see of Salamis (also called Constantia), and not (in Dr. Hatch's meaning of the words) 'responsible to God alone.' Its 'autocephalous' character of course meant its independence of any external control, such as that of an exarch or patriarch,<sup>1</sup> and was probably the result of a combination of accidents. The Cypriots happened to be of Cyril's party at the Council of Ephesus, and any pretension raised against the authority of the absent Bishop of Antioch (who would be the exarch and patriarch in question) was sure to obtain a favourable hearing from Alexandrian ears (Ephesus, Canon 8).<sup>2</sup>

Armenia differed integrally from Cyprus, in that it was a

<sup>1</sup> In which it resembles the Churches of any province in communion with the Church of England; at least so far as the Patriarchate of Canterbury is not one of jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup> See also Bright, *ad loc.*



Church lying outside the limits of the Roman world, and its relation to the ecclesiastical confederation of the empire is only part of the wider problem of the position 'of the Churches of God which are among the barbarians' (Constant. Canon 2). It is as absurd of Dr. Hatch not to mention this as it is for him to prove Armenia 'autocephalous' out of the *Notitia* of the Emperor Leo Sapiens at the end of the ninth century. It would have been more pertinent to quote the canons of Constantinople and Chalcedon which regulate the 'barbarian Churches.' 'They are to be ordered,' says the earlier Council, 'according to the usage of the fathers which has prevailed;' or more definitely at Chalcedon, 'the bishops of the afore-named dioceses [Pontus, Asia and Thrace] who are among the barbarians must be ordained' by the Bishop of Constantinople; in other words, the authority over 'barbarian' bishops, which had previously resided in the exarch of any of those three 'dioceses,' is transferred with most of the rest of their privileges to the Church of the capital. If there is one case more than another which the Council may be supposed to have had directly in view, it must certainly have been that of Armenia, which, ever since the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator of Armenia (c. 300 A.D.), had professed dependence on the Bishop of Cæsarea, and received from him the consecration of its metropolitan. The re-arrangements of the Council, indeed, never took effect, for the national Church of Armenia has been separated from the Greek Church from that day to this. But the principle assumed in the canon is quite decisive against Dr. Hatch's view. All Churches outside the empire were regarded as having some sort of filial relation to one of the great Churches within it; and the facts corresponded fairly to the theory. Thus Ethiopia was subject to Alexandria, as Armenia to Cæsarea, and the Persian Church through its Catholicos was connected with the Patriarchate of Antioch.

IV. In passing to the fourth and last of the heads under which we ranged the main conditions of our English Church polity, it will probably be objected by Dr. Hatch and those who, with him, lay stress on the divergences of form between ancient and modern Christianity, that no attempt can confessedly be made to illustrate directly from the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries the principle of National Churches, a principle of such cardinal importance to the Church of England. But is not the demand a little unreasonable? So far as the Church was co-extensive with the empire there could, in the nature of things, be no national Churches, for there were, of course, no nations. So far as the Church had

penetrated beyond the empire, the Christian communities were yet in their childhood, dependent, like children, on the communities which had founded them from within the empire and still supplied them with the machinery of their organization.<sup>1</sup> All that can be fairly asked is that it should be shown that the principles then acted on were consonant with the idea of national Churches, and such as would naturally, under altered circumstances, have resulted in their creation. Some, indeed, of the then existing ecclesiastical divisions—such as the ‘dioceses’ or exarchates of Britain, Gaul, Spain, Africa, or Egypt—were more or less conterminous with what we might call ‘national’ limits. Or to put another point of view, the Patriarchates of Rome and Constantinople, of Alexandria and Antioch, represent pretty well the great Latin-speaking and Greek-speaking portions of the empire and the outlying Coptic and Syriac districts. Even more strictly parallel is the curious instance of the African and Numidian provinces, where the ecclesiastical followed, not the civil, but the ethnical boundaries. According to the secular organization, Africa, the proconsular or senatorial province, took the coast, and Numidia, a consular or imperial province, took the interior. But this division was purely artificial, and was due to the danger of barbarian invasions from inland, which necessitated the command there of a military governor; the ancient and ethnical boundary lay not so much from north-west to south-east as from north to south, and this, it is noteworthy, was the demarcation adopted by the Church. So the *Notitia*; so, too, the constant reckoning of Augustine among the Numidian bishops, although his see town of Hippo Regius lay in Africa Proconsularis.

The true justification from these early centuries of the principle of national Churches will be, however, not in this or that more or less parallel instance, but in the then universally accepted system, according to which the ecclesiastical organization was modelled on the civil. The very idea of the employment of civil divisions at all forces the conclusion that the nation, had it existed as a definite civil unit, would have formed a definite ecclesiastical unit also.

Before proceeding to the ecclesiastical side of the inquiry, it will be convenient to sketch briefly the civil organization of the Roman empire, in its corresponding scale. Working upwards, the unit which the diocese forms in the Church, the ‘city’ formed in the Roman state. For the city was emphati-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hatch, who maintains the ‘autocephalous’ character of Armenia, ought surely to regard it as the earliest National Church.

call  
tion  
ceiv  
with  
or v  
of t  
poss  
in t  
been  
num  
of l  
exp  
the  
eigh  
whic  
two  
doci  
trate  
not

conc  
of th  
time  
unif  
distr  
orga  
a co  
prov  
man  
was  
one  
insta

wärt  
gegrü  
punk  
und l  
word

In oth  
if we  
city a  
(answ  
was t  
By th  
tratin  
nome

cally not, as with us, an urban as opposed to a rural population, but an urban and a surrounding rural population conceived of as one. Every landowner was a citizen of the city within whose sphere his property was situated. Every 'vicus' or village belonged to some 'civitas,' which was the 'patria' of the villagers.<sup>1</sup> The city—that is to say, the place which possessed a municipal constitution—was a universal element in the Roman world, just because the whole of that world had been open either to Roman or to Greek influence; but the number of cities varied, in proportion especially to the degree of Latinization or Hellenization which each province had experienced. The 'diocese' of Asia numbered 326 cities in the sixth century; that of Pontus, twice its size, only seventy-eight. The tiny (Diocletianist) province of Proconsular Asia, which had long been thoroughly Hellenized, numbered forty-two or forty-three towns; the much larger provinces of Cappadocia, where neither Greek nor Roman influence had penetrated with ease to replace the old tribal organizations, could not muster more than twelve.<sup>2</sup>

The city was, so to speak, a natural product, and different conditions had shaped its growth differently in various parts of the empire. But the province, certainly from Diocletian's time, and to a less extent before, was artificial, and therefore uniform. We need not remind our readers that conquered districts were from the earliest days of Roman dominion organized as 'provinces.' In the course of centuries there was a continual and always growing tendency to split up one province into two or more, with advantages and disadvantages manifest enough; and to secure the one and obviate the other was one feature of Diocletian's great reorganization. With the one aim he carried subdivision still further, so that Egypt, for instance, once a single province, consisted now of six: but he

<sup>1</sup> Ulpian as quoted by Kuhn, who sums up thus (p. 30): 'Vergegenwärtigt man sich, dass die Städte der Alten zu dem ausdrücklichen Zweck gegründet wurden, damit sie den Besitzern der Ländereien als Centralpunkte und Wohnplätze dienten, so durfte man voraussetzen, dass Stadt und Land in dem Alterthume zu einer organischen Einheit verbunden worden seien, nicht so wie bei uns einen Gegensatz gebildet hätten.'

<sup>2</sup> Egypt is the notable exception originally to the organization by cities. In other provinces there were proportionally more or less cities: in Egypt, if we except Alexandria and one or two others, there were none. What the city and its region was elsewhere, the 'nome' and its 'metropolis' (answering not to the *μητρόπολις* but to the *πόλις* of the rest of the world) was to Egypt. The 'nome' was the diocese; its capital the see-town. By the time of the Councils, however, the city organization was penetrating Egypt, and the conciliar lists give usually the name, not of the nome, but of the metropolis (Kuhn, p. 464 *sqq.*).

also grouped the provinces themselves into a new system of *διοικήσεις* or administrative districts of which there were only thirteen or fourteen in the whole empire;<sup>1</sup> and just as each province had its metropolis, so each 'diocese' had its capital as the residence of the supreme governor.

If we take our stand at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), it will be a facile task to demonstrate from its canons to what an almost servile extent the dominating characteristic of imitation coloured the Church system. As the city corresponded to the episcopal see, so the civil province was also the ecclesiastical province, and the metropolis or capital of the one gave his title to the 'metropolitan' of the other; the civil *διοίκησις* or 'diocese' was the ecclesiastical exarchate, and the capital of the 'diocese' was the see of the exarch.<sup>2</sup> No place except a 'city' was entitled to a bishop; but every place which by imperial edict might be raised to the civil rank of city, could *ipso facto* claim a similar privilege in the ecclesiastical sphere as the see-town of a bishop's *παροιμία* or diocese in our own sense (Chalcedon, Canon 17). In the same way when a civil province was divided, the Church followed suit. When, nearly a century earlier, Valens split up Cappadocia into Prima and Secunda, Anthimus of Tyana, the metropolis of the new civil province, claimed, and in the end with success (as against St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, hitherto the only metropolis for all Cappadocia), the dignity of an ecclesiastical metropolitan. On the other hand, the division by imperial edict of an ecclesiastical province, at the instance of intriguing bishops, was declared null and void, the civil or 'real' metropolis being alone entitled to possess in its bishop a metropolitan (Chalcedon, Canon 12). Again, just as the groups of cities or bishoprics formed a province, so the groups of provinces become a *διοίκησις* or exarchate, whether ecclesiastically or civilly, and the bishops of any one exarchate are forbidden to interfere with the affairs of another (Constantinople, Canon 2); and just as the metropolitan stands at the head of the province, so does the exarch stand at the head of the exarchate, and an appeal lies from the metropolitan to him (Chalcedon, Canons

<sup>1</sup> Britain, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Italy, Illyricum, Dacia, Macedonia, Thrace, Asia, Pontus, East or Oriens, Egypt, and the Vicariate of Rome.

<sup>2</sup> It may be convenient to present this in a tabular form:

Civil πόλις ( <i>civitas</i> )	} = ecclesiastical <i>παροιμία</i> or diocese (under a bishop).
or city	
Civil ἐπαρχία ( <i>provincia</i> )	} = same ecclesiastically (under a metropolitan).
or province	
Civil <i>διοίκησις</i> ( <i>diacesis</i> )	} = ecclesiastically an exarchate (under an exarch).
or 'diocese'	

9,  
exte  
the  
part  
teen  
δημ  
ἀκο  
in th  
S  
pute  
cime  
Sym  
of an  
—no  
inve  
the l  
the a  
hand  
or in  
the e  
tions  
Bish  
this  
spon  
him a  
list o  
ourse  
Hier  
of tw  
the m  
patria  
civil.  
eccles  
W  
hinted  
exhau  
that a  
posse  
Const  
tioch,  
unite  
world.  
their  
three  
mutua

9, 17). It is true that we have seen that another, and to some extent rival, organization was evolving itself by the middle of the fifth century, and true that these patriarchates were only partially formed on civil lines; but on the whole the seventeenth canon accurately sums the case: τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθεῖται. 'Let the civil and public models be imitated in the arrangement of the ecclesiastical dioceses as well.'

So close was the resemblance that it can even be a disputed point whether, for instance, the earliest complete specimen of the *Notitie* (or lists of cities and provinces), the *Synecdemus* of Hierocles, written about A.D. 535, is primarily of an ecclesiastical or of a civil character. Professor Ramsay—now unfortunately no longer of Oxford—whose Phrygian investigations are among the most important contributions of the last few years to Christian history, is so much struck with the accuracy with which Hierocles' list corresponds on the one hand to the traces of cities identified by remains of buildings or inscriptions *in situ*, and on the other to similar evidence for the existence of episcopal sees derived from conciliar subscriptions, &c., that in the important paper on the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* which we have named at the head of this article he not only concludes for the universal correspondence of city and bishopric, but supposes, if we understand him aright, that the *Synecdemus* itself is ecclesiastical. 'The list of Hierocles is the list of the bishops of his time.' For ourselves, we think that the position of *Ælia* or Jerusalem in Hierocles, where it appears in its civil position simply as one of twenty-two cities of Palestine, eighth in a series headed by the metropolis Cæsarea, and not in its ecclesiastical rank as a patriarchate, forbids us to suppose that the list is not primarily civil. But if so, this only renders its close connexion with the ecclesiastical organization the more remarkable.

We must not, however, forget that, as we have already hinted, the civil grades of city, province, and exarchate do not exhaust the ecclesiastical federation of Chalcedon. We saw that at Nicæa already three great sees were confirmed in the possession of unique privileges, and that by the addition of Constantinople and Jerusalem to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, the five patriarchates of Chalcedon are complete, and unite under their different jurisdictions the whole Christian world. But on what grounds did the two new-comers base their claims to rank on the same select level as the other three? Obviously on grounds which, if strictly taken, are mutually exclusive. Constantinople rested her ecclesiastical

assumptions on her civil prerogatives as New Rome. Jerusalem in the civil sphere was only one city of Palæstina Prima, of which Cæsarea (Stratonis) was the metropolis; but to the Christian vision it was the mother Church of Christendom. Whether the patriarchal Churches then owed their uniqueness ultimately to their civil position or to their ecclesiastical traditions will be a question to which Chalcedon gives no answer, or rather gives two inconsistent ones. We are thrown back for the solution of the problem on Nicæa and its recognition of the pre-eminence of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. But since what was recognized at Nicæa was not created there, the investigation belongs rather to the pre-conciliar era of Christianity, and must for the moment be deferred. Only we may call attention in passing to the presumption raised by the consideration that, had sacredness of associations been the chief passport to rank in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, 'the Holy Resurrection of Christ' should have stood, not fifth and last, but first in the order of the patriarchates.<sup>1</sup>

We stand now on the threshold of the really crucial section of our inquiry. We doubt whether even Dr. Hatch would in the end be prepared to deny that the principles which governed fourth-century organization were very largely agreeable with our own of to-day. But at the same time we are fully conscious that between these and what is really primitive he would see a great gulf fixed. If we have shown that the existence of rival organizations in the same sphere, both recognized as genuine, is an unknown thing to the later Church, he would answer that the idea only *gradually* grew up 'that there should be only one bishop in a community. The rule was not firmly established until the third century.'<sup>2</sup> 'Where there was more than one community in a city there was, as a rule, more than one bishop.'<sup>3</sup> If we have proved that the sphere of episcopal authority from the fourth century onwards is not congregational but territorial, Dr. Hatch maintains that in the earlier centuries usually 'a bishop, presbyters, and deacons existed for every Christian community.'<sup>4</sup> 'In the greater part of the Christian world each community was complete in itself;

<sup>1</sup> With something of this feeling, our own Nonjurors, in their curious correspondence with the Orthodox Church, soon after George I.'s accession, proposed to range the 'British Churches' under the Patriarchate of Jerusalem—rather to the surprise of the unromantic Greeks, in whose eyes the order of the patriarchates had long been stereotyped into a superstition. See G. Williams, *Orthodox and Nonjurors*.

<sup>2</sup> *Bampton Lectures*, p. 103.

<sup>3</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>1</sup> *Ch.*  
<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*  
suppos  
his con  
human  
<sup>3</sup> *B.*



every town, and sometimes every village, had its bishop.<sup>1</sup> 'Where the episcopal system had established itself, there was a bishop wherever in later times there would have been a parish church.'<sup>2</sup> If we have displayed the principle of federation extending its complex and comprehensive machinery from Nicæa to Chalcedon, Dr. Hatch asserts roundly that such a thing as any idea of dependency of any sort was unknown to the really primitive Church. 'The original conceptions of Christian association were but two in number: that of the single congregation, and that of the whole aggregate of Christian believers throughout the world.'<sup>3</sup> 'In primitive times every Christian community was independent of every other, and every Christian bishop was regarded as having received his commission direct from the chief Shepherd.'<sup>4</sup> 'There is no trace of the dependence of any one community upon any other.'<sup>5</sup> Where we have illustrated the exact parallelism of the see and its diocese to the city and its region in the Church under the Christian emperors, and have called attention to the varying proportions of 'cities' in different provinces, which would imply consequently a varying proportion of dioceses, Dr. Hatch, anxious, we suppose, to emphasize the 'haphazard' character of Christian organization, draws up in array no less than five causes, each of which is apparently conceived to have operated in producing a specific kind of episcopal system;<sup>6</sup> and where we have argued that, while it is unreasonable to expect to find national Churches at a time when there were no nations, the ideas which subsequently shaped them were familiar to the carefully-graded federation of the fourth-century Church, Dr. Hatch mentions only the provincial organization, and arbitrarily selects it to contrast with our own. 'The locality is conterminous with the State, and the majority which exercises control is the majority, not of the immediate neighbourhood, but of the whole political area.'<sup>7</sup>

In arguing back from the fourth to the preceding centuries it is not unnecessary to formulate a truism at the outset. We must not anticipate the presence of an elaborate organization before the Church had time or opportunity to organize. The missionary dioceses of modern times are created with only loose territorial definitions—and these often not civil or natural,

<sup>1</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 18.<sup>2</sup> *B. L.* p. 79.<sup>3</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 139.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 126. We may be allowed to ask whether Dr. Hatch, then, supposes that an English bishop of to-day is 'regarded as having received his commission' from the Metropolitan? or from the Crown? or from any human source at all?<sup>5</sup> *B. L.* p. 195.<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 195-205.<sup>7</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 142.

but mere parallels of latitude or longitude—and of course without any approach to provincial federation. It was the same in the earliest days of the Church of Christ. Until the middle of the second century Christianity was in many provinces of the empire as purely missionary as it is now in Central Africa. It is therefore in the highest degree uncritical to demand from us that we should produce evidence of a state of things which under parallel circumstances we should not ourselves think of creating nowadays; and that in default of the impossible we should be branded with the label of the unprimitive. If we can show that, while our missionary Churches may be compared with the pioneer work of Christianity in the Roman world, our settled Churches are organized in substantial agreement with the earliest settled Churches of the primitive age, our position is, it seems to us, impregnable.

I. To take our first point and Dr. Hatch's counter-theory. We shall not, we fancy, be doing an injustice to him when we suggest that his assertion of the recognized coexistence of two bishops in one city is connected with his favourite dogma of 'free association,'<sup>1</sup> or the right of any malcontents to form themselves into a rival community. Nor shall we be accused of exaggerating matters when we lay it down that such a theory is in blank contradiction of the whole principle of Catholic order as the Church understands and, we believe, always has understood it. It may, therefore, be worth while to deal thoroughly, even at some risk of tediousness, with the evidence adduced by Dr. Hatch in support of his contention.

In the *Bampton Lectures* (p. 103) the solitary argument is drawn from the case of Cornelius and Novatian at Rome. The problem of the right treatment of the lapsed pushed itself to the front after the Decian persecution; and when the Roman Church elected for its bishop in Cornelius a representative of the party who were for readmission after penance, the rigorist party refused to recognize him as their chief pastor, and set up another bishop and a rival organization. Dr. Hatch says truly enough that in Novatian's case—

'all the elements of a valid election were present. Under ordinary circumstances, or in a newly organized community, the election would have been unchallenged. There was only one point in which it was exceptional. That exceptional point was that Rome already possessed a complete organization. The question arose whether it was competent, under any circumstances, for a new organization to be established side by side with an existing organization in the same city. The question does not seem to have been raised before.'

<sup>1</sup> *B. L.* p. 106.

We  
but  
we  
tha  
esta  
que

but  
inst  
and  
vali  
ded  
pos  
Rom  
whe  
tian  
reco  
vi. 4  
σκο  
Gos  
in a  
neli  
Nov  
men  
brin  
one  
from  
retur  
that  
and  
mula  
Hato  
'one  
alone  
expr  
at all

B  
Chur  
able,  
entire  
in th

1 V  
which  
that th  
who h

We doubt whether the latter statement is quite correct; but at any rate it represents Dr. Hatch's point of view, and we now understand that when, on the previous page, he says that 'the rule' (of one bishop only in a city) 'was not firmly established till the third century,' he means merely that 'the question had not been raised before.'

So far Dr. Hatch is guilty only of confusion of language; but in the next words we are confronted with a serious instance of confusion of thought. 'In Asia Minor, in Syria, and in Africa, Novatian's election was for a time held to be valid.' We doubt the fact; but our quarrel is only with the deduction drawn from it, that these Churches recognized the possibility of there being simultaneously two Bishops of Rome. It does not seem to occur to Dr. Hatch to consider whether those Churches or individuals who recognized Novatian recognized *Cornelius as well*. That Cornelius did not recognize Novatian we know from his letter in Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 43): ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἓνα ἐπισκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. 'This guardian of the Gospel was not aware, then, that there ought to be *one* bishop in a Catholic Church.' That Novatian did not recognize Cornelius is clear from the account in Cyprian (*Ep.* xlv.), where Novatian's ambassadors base the claim for the acknowledgment of their bishop on the ground of the accusations they bring against Cornelius. That all parties admitted that only one of the two could be the true bishop seems to result from the declaration of the Novatianist confessors on their return to the communion of Cornelius: 'We are not ignorant that there is one God and one Christ . . . one Holy Spirit, and one bishop rightly in the Catholic Church.' This formula, contained in a letter from Cornelius, is quoted by Dr. Hatch as the summing up of a paragraph attributing the 'one bishop' view to the efforts of Cyprian, and Cyprian alone. It is at least curious, then, that the most pointed expression of the 'Cyprianic' doctrine came, not from Cyprian at all, but from ex-Novatianists.

But when we turn from the *Bampton Lectures* to the *Church Institutions*, it strikes one from the first as remarkable, that while in the one this singular theory was built up entirely on the supposed evidence of the Novatianist dispute, in the other that ground is abandoned altogether,<sup>1</sup> and 'the

<sup>1</sup> We were at a loss to comprehend the significance of this *volte-face*, which is not at all in Dr. Hatch's manner, until it was pointed out to us that the German translator of the *Bampton Lectures*, Professor Harnack, who has substantially identified himself with the views of the English

decisive passage' is 'Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxviii. 7, who says that "Alexandria never had two bishops as the other cities had." This statement of Epiphanius attracted attention centuries back, and Bingham tells us (book ii. ch. 13), that Bishop Pearson originally interpreted it to imply that 'St. Mark, being the only preacher of the gospel at Alexandria, left but one bishop his successor; but in other Churches sometimes two Apostles gathered Churches, and each of them left a bishop in his place.' Pearson, however, as Bingham adds in a note, himself altered his opinion, and in his posthumous *Dissertations on the Roman Succession*<sup>1</sup> points out the entire absence of primitive evidence for his earlier view. Yet even if it had been historical, little could be deduced from it in favour of the general principle against which we are now contending. For the only probable explanation of such a double episcopate, if it ever existed, is that different bishops were consecrated for the Jewish and Gentile communities. But since the accident of birth, and not the exercise of choice, would in that case decide the position of the individual Christian, we are still as far as ever from any 'free association.' It is pertinent to add that at the utmost no one speaks of more than two bishops in one city, and it would be a very restricted 'freedom of association' which limited the possibilities of selection to a couple of ecclesiastical superiors.

But it is a profitless task to waste words on any interpretation of an unhistorical figment, for the passage in Epiphanius, the *fons et origo mali*, admits—nay demands—a wholly different exegesis. Let us see. In the sixty-eighth chapter of the work against Heresies, Epiphanius gives his account, not without some partiality for the seceders, of the Meletian schism. Meletius, a bishop of the Thebaid, separated himself from the communion of Peter of Alexandria on the question of the reconciliation of the lapsed. Both bishops were sufferers in the Great Persecution. Peter, who with the Church

original, throws cold water on this particular hypothesis. 'Ich kenne überhaupt keinen Grund der gegen die Annahme spricht, dass sich die Regel, in jeder Stadt sei stets nur *ein* katholischer Bischof zu dulden, bereits am Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts fest gestellt sei' (*Analekten zu Hatch*, p. 252).

<sup>1</sup> 'Novum igitur erat hoc commentum de duobus aut tribus episcopis simul Romæ præsentibus, nec veterum cuiquam cognitum, antequam Ruffinus ex epistola supposititia Clementis, quam uti genuinum verterat et Romano orbi intulerat, hoc effugium excogitavit, ut merces suas vendibiles faceret' (*Minor Works*, ed. Churton, ii. p. 452). Obviously the idea was originated in the interest of the direct Apostolic ordination of Clement and Ignatius, it being notorious that these fathers did not stand first on the list in the authentic *διαδοχαί* of Rome and Antioch.

ge  
wh  
th  
Pa  
pla  
'C  
to  
ap  
as  
bis  
the  
cla  
of  
of  
his  
die  
abs  
to  
τὸν  
τῆς  
ἐκ  
Θε

"B  
Bis  
Eg  
fou  
app

Car  
wh  
riva  
Me  
ally  
Ale  
and  
bish  
cau  
Me  
whi

δοκ  
ἀρχ  
Epip

generally had taken the milder view, was martyred. Meletius, who represented Novatianist principles, was condemned to the mines. In the course of his journey as a prisoner to Palestine, the rigorist bishop 'in every locality and in every place' appointed bishops, presbyters, and deacons of the 'Church of the Martyrs.' On the restoration of peace, he took up his residence in Alexandria, where he worshipped apart with his sympathizers, but for the rest is represented as having lived on friendly terms with the then Catholic bishop, Alexander, being the first to give him information of the heretical opinions expressed by Arius. Meletius did not claim the title of Bishop of Alexandria, but apparently that of Bishop or Archbishop of Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Before the Council of Nicæa he died. No immediate action was taken to fill his place; but when, soon after the Council, Alexander, too, died, and Athanasius, on whom all eyes were fixed, was absent, so that no consecration could take place, the Meletians took advantage of the occasion. *Λαβόμενοι καιρὸν οἱ κατὰ τὸν Μελέτιον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἐπισκόπου μὴ παρόντος τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας (οὐ γὰρ ποτὲ ἡ Ἀλεξανδρεία δύο ἐπισκόπους εἶχεν, ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις), καθιστάσιν τοῖνυν ἀντὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεωνᾶν, κ.τ.λ.*

'Those [Alexandrines] who had attached themselves to Meletius "Bishop of Egypt," in the absence of any [Meletian or Catholic] Bishop of Alexandria—for Alexandria, unlike any other city [in Egypt], never had a second bishop [of the Meletian opposition]—found an opportune moment [in the vacancy of the see], and appointed Theonas to Alexander's place.'

Can anything be simpler? Epiphanius only means that whereas in every other Egyptian city a rival Church and a rival organization from bishop downwards was started by the Meletians, in Alexandria Meletius himself officiated episcopally for his community, but under the title, not of Bishop of Alexandria, but of Bishop of Egypt. Alexander of Alexandria was therefore, from their point of view, the one Catholic bishop still left in possession of his see; and it was the vacancy caused by his death which they pretended to fill up with a Meletian successor. Alexandria in fact was the one city which, until many years after the organization of the schism,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Hæres.* lxi. (p. 96, Dind.) 'Ὁ Μελέτιος ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ Θεβαΐδος δοκῶν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος . . . ἀπηνέγκε τοῖνυν εἰς τὰ ὅσα τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξάνδρου ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Μελέτιος ὁ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον.

It should be remembered that the whole account in the text is simply Epiphanius' version of the facts.

never had two bishops taking their names from the same see. Let us hear no more of this 'decisive passage.'<sup>1</sup>

But if the evidence brought forward by Dr. Hatch has thus vanished at the touch of criticism, what is the condition of the evidence on the other side? It would be superfluous to quote the pithy reply of the Roman populace to Constantius: 'One God, one Christ, one Bishop;' or to appeal to the arrangements of the eighth canon of Nicæa (on the reception of Novatianists) 'to prevent there being two bishops in one city,' where 'the principle is not so much enforced as assumed by the Council' (Bright, *ad loc.*): for Dr. Hatch will not dispute the universality of the rule in the fourth century. But a full hundred years earlier than Nicæa occurred what was probably a fairly close anticipation of the problem between Cornelius and Novatian, for, as we have already hinted, we are not satisfied that that question 'had not been raised before their time.' Dr. Hatch himself calls attention (*B. L.* p. 104, note 41) to 'the important fact' that Hippolytus 'was an adherent, possibly a bishop, of the Puritan party.' Now, if Hippolytus was, as the acute investigations of Dr. von Döllinger leave to our minds little doubt, not only a Puritan Bishop but Puritan Bishop of Rome, we have the later controversy exactly foreshadowed. But here, too, Hippolytus did not recognize Callistus as a true bishop: rather he was the head of a *διδασκαλεῖον* or school of heretics (*Ref. Omn. Hær.* b. ix.). Neither did Callistus recognize Hippolytus, and it was probably just because the official lists of Roman bishops contained no trace of any other episcopate than Callistus', that Eusebius professed himself unable to state over what see Hippolytus presided; for his writings would directly prove him a bishop, and the surroundings would point to no other city than Rome, while yet Rome, in face of the episcopal *διαδοχή* with which the historian was well acquainted, was out of the question. The problem therefore remained to Eusebius insoluble.

Yet another century can we ascend. How does Dr. Hatch interpret this passage from Ignatius? —

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Döllinger, it is true (*Christenthum und Kirche*, p. 324), thinks that Epiphanius is referring to the passage in *Apost. Const.* vii. 46, where Antioch and Ephesus are said each to have had two bishops consecrated by Apostles (and therefore perhaps contemporaneous), but we doubt whether Epiphanius could have used *αἱ ἅλλαι πόλεις* of two cities only, when in the same passage of the *Constitutions* Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Rome and Smyrna are mentioned, besides Alexandria, as having had successive and not contemporaneous bishops. In any case the context in Epiphanius appears to us decisive of the primary reference.



'For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God. . . . If any man followeth one that maketh a schism (σχίζοντι), he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. . . . Be ye therefore careful to observe one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup into union in His Blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop' (Ign. *Ad Philad.* ii. iv.).

What is the meaning of *σχίζειν* and *σχίσμα* in Christian literature at all, if the 'free right of association' permitted a section of the congregation to secede from their bishop whenever they liked to set up a new one?

II. We have no hesitation in pronouncing Dr. Hatch's counter-theory on our first point untenable. But he opens up in the second place a problem which can at least be legitimately argued on both sides, when he urges that the earliest evidence goes to show that episcopacy was originally congregational and not diocesan. It is curious, however, that he nowhere, as far as we have seen, states any of the grounds for this view, except the presumption drawn from the large number of bishops in Proconsular Asia and North Africa.<sup>1</sup> But the latter is not Eastern at all, and a more unfortunate illustration than the former he could not have chosen, for the forty-two bishops of (the later) Proconsular Asia were just the bishops of the forty-two cities, and we have here, not congregational episcopacy at all, but simply another example of the parallelism of dioceses and cities. Village bishops was exactly what they were not.

We can, therefore, only conjecture what evidence Dr. Hatch would think fit to call. He would, we suppose, call attention primarily to the remarkable treatise entitled *Διαταγὰὶ Κλήμεντος*, *Constitutions of Clement*, or, as the German editors<sup>2</sup> have named it, *Apostolische Kirchenordnung* (quoted as '*K.O.*'), chapters 15 to 23 of which (in Harnack's notation) contain directions for the organization of a Church on the smallest permissible scale. The locality of this pseudo-Apostolic piece is pretty certainly Egyptian, and this portion in its original form can scarcely have been later than the beginning of the third century. In spite of the corrupt character of the text as it stands, we are fairly confident that the minimum of officers provided in the case specified, where a community

<sup>1</sup> *Bampton Lectures*, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> It is to be found either in Bickell's *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* (1843), p. 107, or in Harnack's *Lehre der zwölf Apostel* (1884), p. 225 of the Prolegomena.

could not muster more than twelve voters for an episcopal election, should be restored as a bishop, two presbyters,<sup>1</sup> two (or possibly three) deacons, a reader, and three widows. The conclusion would not be unnatural that we have here the village community and its bishop. But is this necessary? We think not. It should be observed, and is undeniable, that the treatise contemplates only the first formation of a settled ministry. The community is one which is still in its infancy, and there is nothing to prevent our seeing here, not the normal size of a village Church, but the small beginnings of a city one. So we are told, on the authority of Gregory of Nyssa, that the important city of Neocæsarea, in Pontus, when Gregory Thaumaturgus became its bishop (A.D. 240), contained only seventeen Christians.

If the first witness called turns out under cross-examination to bring no evidence to the point, from the next we derive more substantial testimony. The names and sees are preserved of eighty-seven African bishops who voted at Cyprian's Council on Rebaptism in A.D. 256. By the aid of the excellent map of Africa, in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, about fifty sees can be identified with known 'cities'; of the rest, the majority could not be traced, and many of them probably belong to cities whose sites are not yet discovered; but one or two seemed to belong to places proved to have been, at some time at any rate, not cities, but 'vici' or villages.<sup>2</sup> Again, when Athanasius says that the Mareotis never had 'bishop or chor-episcopus, but only presbyters in charge of its villages,'<sup>3</sup> it would probably follow that he knew of bishops in such places elsewhere. But all such evidence fails to go to the root of the matter. It is not enough for Dr. Hatch to show that there were sometimes bishops in villages, or that, speaking generally, there were a great many bishops everywhere. For, on the diocesan theory, the dioceses may occasionally be so small as to be little larger than congregations. If, on the other hand, the congregational theory be true, the bishop's sphere ought never to be larger than a congregation.

And there is evidence, not perhaps very decisive—but still not without weight—which suggests that a primitive bishop's sphere was sometimes very extensive. When Ignatius calls himself 'the Bishop of Syria,' τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας (*Ep. ad Rom.* 2), the most natural exegesis of the words would make

<sup>1</sup> Cf. an interesting inscription, describing a somewhat similar organization, quoted by Dr. Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, 199 n.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Horrea Coeliæ, on the coast south of Karthage.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. *Apol. c. Arianos*, 85, quoted by Bright, on Nicæa, Canon 8.

Sy  
poss  
(dio  
(ἐπι  
(ib.  
"Al  
Bish  
(ἐπι  
fican  
may  
and  
appl  
eith  
their  
auth  
shad  
ceiv  
dioc  
is p  
pres  
cent

Hat  
this  
four  
bidd  
than  
of di  
the in  
desc  
Arab  
cent  
bish  
perin  
'citi  
had  
the s  
S  
of ch  
befo  
they

<sup>1</sup> I  
bish  
phan

<sup>2</sup> P

Syria his diocese. Doubtful as this may be, there are other possible indications. If Eusebius speaks of the *παροικίαι* (dioceses or Churches) of Gaul over which Irenæus 'was bishop' (*ἐπισκόπει*, *H. E.* v. 23), and of 'the *παροικίαι* of Alexandria' (*ib.* v. 22), or *τῶν αὐτόθι παροικίων* (where *αὐτόθι* refers to 'Alexandria and the rest of Egypt,' *ib.* vi. 2), as those of which Bishop Demetrius had received the 'oversight' or 'episcopate' (*ἐπισκοπή*), the possible explanations are several, but all significant for our present purpose. 'The Churches of Alexandria' may quite conceivably mean the 'parishes' of Alexandria, and then we have testimony to the diocesan theory.<sup>1</sup> As applied to Egypt at large and to Gaul, the plural implies either that Irenæus and Demetrius were the only bishops in their respective countries, or, as we prefer to believe, that their authority as prelates of Lyons and Alexandria so far overshadowed that of their colleagues that either could be conceived of as holding the 'episcopate' or 'oversight' of the dioceses of their suffragans. In the one case the argument is pertinent here; in the other it bears on what we shall presently proceed to prove, the anticipations in the earlier centuries of the federated system of the later.

The consideration, however, which finally disposes of Dr. Hatch's view, is the scantiness of any traces of the survival of this once universal village episcopacy, when we reach in the fourth century the full daylight of history. If, as we are bidden to believe, Christendom once knew of no other bishop than the parochial bishop, where did he disappear to? Yet of direct evidence for his later existence, we know none but the instances quoted in Bingham<sup>2</sup> from Synesius and Sozomen, descriptive of Egypt (but only isolated cases), Cyprus, and Arabia. Since, then, these authors both belong to the fifth century, it would seem equally probable that the village bishoprics they mention were either contemporary local experiments, or were located in places which had once been 'cities,' though, in the general process of depopulation, they had ceased to be so, as that they were genuine survivals of the second or third centuries.

Still, a presumption might be derived from the existence of chorepiscopi or country bishops. We do not hear of them before the fourth century. But it is scarcely possible that they were originally an institution of that time; for from the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hatch, however, admits the diocesan character of the early bishopric of Alexandria, which is, indeed, abundantly clear. Cf. Epi-phanus, *Her.* 68, 69.

<sup>2</sup> Book II. ch. xii.

very first moment we meet with the order it is in a state of progressive decay. In numbers: for at Nicæa fourteen signatures out of over two hundred are those of chorepiscopi; at Chalcedon we have not noticed more than three out of over six hundred: again, at Ancyra, Neocæsarea, Nicæa, and Antioch their existence as one of the regular grades of Church officers is assumed without question; at Laodicea further appointments to the order are forbidden (Canon 59). In function: at Nicæa they sign on their own account, at Chalcedon only as deputies of absent bishops: at Antioch they are allowed to promote to minor orders without consulting the city bishop (Canon 10); but St. Basil denies them this, on the ground of 'the canons of the Fathers' (*Ep.* 54). Speaking generally, at the opening of the conciliar period they are true bishops; witness their signature at Councils, their power of ordination (with the bishop's consent) to the diaconate and priesthood (Ancyra, Can. 13, Antioch, Can. 10), and the clear contrast between them and the country presbyters (Neocæsarea, Can. 14, Antioch, Can. 8). By the middle of the fifth century there is little or nothing to distinguish the chorepiscopus from the presbyter. Gregory Nazianzen (probably) and Theodoret (certainly) speak of individual chorepiscopi as if they actually were simply presbyters; and that they sign as deputies at Chalcedon proves nothing to the contrary, for many presbyters did the same.

If the chorepiscopi are, then, most probably a survival of earlier ages, we have little hesitation in conceding to Dr. Hatch that they represent descent from something perhaps not unlike the village bishops, and that, as the chorepiscopus was a more independent personage in A.D. 325 than in A.D. 450, it is probable that he was more independent still in A.D. 200, if he existed, than in A.D. 325; in fact, that he was originally a diocesan bishop.

Yet we doubt whether this will carry Dr. Hatch very far, for the chorepiscopus was—and this point merits more notice than it has received—a very local institution. The fourteen chorepiscopi at Nicæa come from only five, mostly contiguous, provinces—Cœlesyria, Cilicia, Isauria, Cappadocia, and Bithynia. In no case does their number bear a large proportion to the total of bishops present from the province, except for Cappadocia, which sent ten bishops, five of them chorepiscopi. From the same locality proceed a very large proportion of the extant references to the order. To Cappadocia belong St. Basil's letter to his chorepiscopi on their duty with regard to ordination (*Ep.* 54) and St. Gregory's lament that Basil, not

1 C  
2 C  
polis b  
elder C  
Philipp  
porum.  
3 N  
Peye- fo  
compar  
town.—  
VOL.

content with having fifty chorepiscopi under him, raised Sasima to the dignity of a see and made himself (Gregory) its bishop.<sup>1</sup> From Cappadocia come the latest traces of the strictly episcopal chorepiscopus, in Timotheus, who early in the fifth century 'ordained Lepidius as priest for a monastery,' and in Cæsarius, chorepiscopus of the city of Arca, who signed in his own name the deposition of Nestorius, if the text may be trusted and Arca be identified with the Arca of Armenia Secunda, practically a part of Cappadocia. And a chorepiscopus representing the Bishop of Arabissus in this last province was one of the three present at Chalcedon.

Can we not assign a rational cause for the multiplication of chorepiscopi in Cappadocia, which will at the same time account for their paucity elsewhere? Cappadocia, as we have already seen, differed markedly from most other provinces in the very limited extent to which city organization prevailed there, and the consequent absence of see-towns for dioceses. When Hierocles wrote, the two Cappadocias contained twelve towns; but before the division of the province by Valens there are no certain traces of more than five.<sup>2</sup> Of four or five of the rest we read in Basil's letters and in the subscriptions of the Council of Constantinople.<sup>3</sup> It would therefore seem that Valens' division of the province, about 370 A.D., was accompanied by the elevation of certain places to the dignity of 'cities,' and in particular we learn from St. Basil that part of both the senate and the people of Cæsarea were transported to form the new city of Podandus (*Ep.* 74). Possibly Valens, reckoning on the ecclesiastical arrangements following the political, aimed at diminishing not only Basil's metropolitical authority by dividing his province, but his diocesan authority by depleting his city. It is clear, then, that before the division of the provinces and the multiplication of the cities the 'regions' over which the magistrates and bishops of each city held sway must have been enormous. This would doubtless have been pre-eminently the case with Cæsarea, and the fifty chorepiscopi of Gregory, after due deduction on

<sup>1</sup> *Carm. de Vita Sua*, 447.

<sup>2</sup> Cæsarea, Tyana, Cybistra were represented at Nicæa. Faustopolis belongs, of course, to the time of M. Aurelius. Nazianzus had the elder Gregory for its bishop. Parnasus was possibly represented at Philippopolis. (The authorities are Kuhn, *ut sup.*; Gams, *Series Episcoporum*.)

<sup>3</sup> Nyssa, Rege-podandus, Sasima, Rege-doara, Parnasus. The prefix *Peye-* for *Περίωρ*, i.e. *regio*, suggests that these places had become 'cities' comparatively late, and were before under the magistrates of some other town.—Kuhn, p. 238.

the score of poetic licence and metrical exigencies, will represent a number not out of all proportion to the position of the capital.

Our hypothesis, then, is that the Church of the fourth century used chorepiscopi as a method of correcting the inequalities in the size of the dioceses which resulted from the widely-varying proportions of cities in different provinces. Where there were few cities, as in Cappadocia, there were chorepiscopi where elsewhere there would have been more city bishops. Where there were many cities, as in Phrygia,<sup>1</sup> and consequently many diocesan bishops, the employment of chorepiscopi was deprecated. No conclusion can thus be drawn from the local rural bishop to a once universal village episcopacy, even if such chorepiscopi as there were were not a fourth-century institution, but really did represent some earlier diocesans, whose see towns being technically 'villages' lost their independent status accordingly, when what had apparently always been the general rule became a universal principle, and the boundaries of the cities controlled everywhere those of the bishoprics.

III. 'There is no trace of the dependence of any one community upon any other.' We beg to differ. There seems to us to be a multiplicity of phenomena of the kind.

We have already pointed out that what is in full working at Nicæa must be of far earlier origin; and the canons of Nicæa postulate an established provincial system. It is now our task to trace this back into the twilight which precedes the full blaze of history. From the very first times the officers of the Christian communities must have occasionally met together in conference, as difficulties arose, after the model of the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. But it is not till the second half of the second century that we light on clear indications of the association of the bishops of a definite territorial area. Dionysius of Corinth, as Eusebius tells us,<sup>2</sup> wrote an epistle to the Bishops of Crete and another to the Bishops of Pontus. The Easter controversy raised by Victor of Rome, at the end of the century, occasioned synods, as we learn from the same writer,<sup>3</sup> in Palestine, Rome, Pontus, Gaul, and Osrhoene. Origen was excommunicated by Demetrius and the assembled bishops of Egypt. Many years before Cyprian, Agrippinus of Karthage had treated of the baptism of heretics in a Council at Karthage, and the same question

<sup>1</sup> See Ramsay, *ut sup.* This will account for the action of the synod of (the Phrygian) Laodicea against chorepiscopi.

<sup>2</sup> *H. E.* iv. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* v. 23.

<sup>1</sup> *CA*  
<sup>2</sup> *BI*  
Hatch  
Africa,  
in the m  
<sup>4</sup> *CA*



had been discussed by meetings at Iconium and Synnada. By the time of the Council of Nicæa the synod was a stereotyped institution with a fixed area corresponding to the civil province, a fixed president in the bishop of the metropolis, and fixed times of meeting every year. But how far do these regulations represent what had been the invariable practice from the first?

Dr. Hatch answers that they do not. 'At first such conferences were held irregularly. There was no stated time or occasion for them. There was no fixed president. There was no limitation of the area from which their members were drawn.'<sup>1</sup> We really do not know that any instance could be cited where a Council which corresponded at all in its general idea with what we mean by a Provincial Council did not draw its members from some well-defined area, national or political. With regard to the presidency, it is true that there are traces in the earliest times of exceptions to the later rule. Eusebius notes that the Bishops of Pontus wrote to Dionysius of Corinth under the headship of Palmas, as the ἀρχαιότατος among them<sup>2</sup>—that is, as the senior either by age or office; and the same may perhaps have been the case on other occasions. In parts of Africa certainly this practice was permanent, for in Numidia the bishop senior by consecration officiated as metropolitan. Thus in the fourth and fifth centuries we hear of Secundus of Tigisis, Megalius of Calama, and Xantippus of Tagaste, all as metropolitans.<sup>3</sup> But the general, and in the East before A.D. 300 the universal, rule is formulated, and its justification given, by the Council of Antioch (Can. 9, quoted above).

The same canon of Antioch will supply us with an answer to Dr. Hatch's oft-repeated protest that the federated system was a total overthrow of the whole primitive idea of episcopacy:—

'Every Christian bishop was regarded as having received his commission direct from the chief Shepherd. The words of the most powerful of early defenders of Catholic unity are conclusive as to the early conception of the independence of bishops, "cum singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> *H. E.* iv. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Bingham, book ii. ch. 16, § 6. It is overstating the case when Dr. Hatch asserts (p. 124) that metropolitans were not recognized 'in North Africa,' for the Bishop of Karthage was certainly metropolitan of 'Africa' in the narrower sense.

<sup>4</sup> *Ch. Inst.* p. 126 and note. Cf. *Bampton Lectures*, p. 71.

Does Dr. Hatch, then, wish us to suppose that between the time when Cyprian wrote in the middle of the third century and the time of the great Councils at the beginning of the fourth a momentous revolution had silently substituted for the episcopal autocracy of the primitive idea the rule of the majority of Churches over the minority? Why, the combination of Cyprian's assertion of episcopal independence with the high importance which the same Cyprian attributes all along to synodical action is nowhere better expressed than in the canon of Antioch: 'Every bishop has authority over his own diocese, and must govern it according to his conscience, and take charge of the whole region subject to his episcopal city, ordaining priests and deacons, and discharging all his duties with circumspection. Further than this he may not venture without the metropolitan, nor the latter without consulting the other bishops.'

But side by side with the earliest *origines* of the later established system, there is even more comprehensive evidence for the general dependence of Churches upon one another. We saw that probably Irenæus, 'who was bishop of the dioceses in Gaul,' and Demetrius, 'who received the episcopate of the dioceses of Alexandria and Egypt,' held a position of supremacy over daughter Churches. And if the testimony of Eusebius be discounted as insufficient, we can also appeal to the *Constitutions of Clement* before mentioned, where the community of less than twelve electors is required to communicate with neighbouring organized Churches, in order the more effectually to compass its episcopal election. But more than this. We can appeal with especial confidence to the great primitive principle, acted on by the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, when they wrote to 'the brethren in Asia and Phrygia,' whence their own missionary founders had come; formulated by Tertullian, when he urged resort to the 'Apostolic Churches' as the depositaries of Apostolic teaching; assumed by Hegesippus and Irenæus, when they drew up their *diadochai* or lists of the episcopal succession, which joined the Roman Church of their day in living continuity with the Roman Church of St. Peter and St. Paul. As each new Church was founded, the Church that evangelized her stood surety for the correctness of the Deposit as she passed it on; and the measure of Christian conviction was the measure of the certainty that the 'tradition' could be tested and traced back from bishop to bishop, and from Church to Church, until in the Apostolic Churches it was at length confronted with the Apostles themselves.

IV. How far a presumption can be drawn from evidence of the first three centuries in favour of national Churches either directly or indirectly is, in face of the absence of data, a difficult question to decide. But the supremacy of the city over the surrounding region, which is a postulate of fourth-century organization, certainly had its roots in the far earlier past; and since a city was only a synonym for a place more central or more populous than the rest, this is only to say, what is surely probable enough, that the Christian Church, at first no doubt unconsciously, modelled itself upon a system which was not only in possession of the field, but approved itself as undoubtedly the most sensible and the most convenient. But it would be waste of time to linger over this longer than to deduce the results suggested by the position of pre-eminence in which, as we have said, the Nicene canons reveal the sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. It has, indeed, been urged that here at least must be traced the influence, not of civil position, but of ecclesiastical and Apostolical tradition.<sup>1</sup> We are unable to accede to such a view. We do not see what answer can be made to the objection that, if Apostolic foundation had anything to do with it, Ephesus, the home of St. Paul and of St. John, ought on all accounts to have ranked above Alexandria. Roman Catholic writers certainly have maintained that these three sees owe their uniqueness to their connexion with St. Peter—Rome and Antioch as his own foundations, Alexandria as that of his disciple, St. Mark. But then again, why should the see of the disciple rank above one of the sees of the master? There is no intelligible explanation open to us, except this, that the order Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, was also the order of their civil importance, and that civilly (and so ecclesiastically) these three cities stood on a level of their own.

We can now bring our task to a close. We have done our best to demonstrate for the satisfaction of Anglican Churchmen that they have no cause to shrink from the most stringent inquiry into the relations of their own to the primitive Church polity. It is a necessary corollary to criticize, perhaps somewhat trenchantly, the counter-hypothesis of a writer who wishes to see, and succeeds in seeing, nothing but divergences. But it is very far from our desire to cherish any animus against Dr. Hatch. We are bound to recognize in him, even when we most differ from him, an unwearied assiduity in collecting from different fields of labour material which may throw light on the darker periods of Christian

<sup>1</sup> See Bright on Canon 3 of Constantinople, p. 93 *sqq.*

history, which merits the most unstinted encomium. Not that his fame is raised by the *Growth of Church Institutions*. His theories have not commanded—we must say that we hope they never will command—such an amount of assent as would justify him in putting them forward in a shape suited for uncritical readers. But if Dr. Hatch should ever think fit to classify his extensive researches into Western Church history of the eighth and ninth centuries on the model of his *Bampton Lectures*, we would pardon by anticipation all his conclusions (and no doubt they would be legion) with which we should disagree, because his notes, like the *apparatus criticus* of a modern edition of the classics, would enable us to correct his text for ourselves. Should he abandon those departments of research in which he is only one of many workers, and concentrate himself where his knowledge and his industry are alike unique, he will be sure to produce something which will deserve well of the republic of letters.

---

### ART. III.—THREE CHURCH DICTIONARIES.

1. *A Church Dictionary*. By W. F. HOOK, D.D., late Dean of Chichester. Fourteenth edition. (London, 1887.)
2. *The Dictionary of Religion*. Edited by the Rev. W. BENHAM, B.D. (London, 1887.)
3. *A Dictionary of the Church of England*. By the Rev. EDWARD L. CUTTS, B.A. Camb. (London.)

SINCE the days when Johnson, according to the variations of his mood, described the composition of a 'Dictionary' as 'drudgery,' or as a kind of 'muddling work' which was rather agreeable to him than otherwise,<sup>1</sup> the term has acquired another sense, as synonymous with 'encyclopædia.' 'Dictionaries' of this type, on all manner of subjects, are a somewhat conspicuous element in the literature of the time. Theology can point to several as her own. Our readers have probably met with the *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, and the *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, and Schools of Thought*; and we now propose to bring under their notice a

<sup>1</sup> Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ed. Birkbeck Hill, v. 418; ii. 204.

few specimens of the three others which are named at the head of this article.

To the first, indeed, they will need no introduction. Some, perhaps, may even remember the first appearance of Dr. Hook's *Church Dictionary*, three years before the great blow which fell upon the Church party, so called—the secession of Mr. Newman. The little volume was very unattractive in outward aspect; and although it contained a large amount of information on matters ecclesiastical, it also exhibited that peculiar type of Anglicanism which was congenial to the marked personality of its author. Seven years ago this *Review* took a survey of the really grand career of one who will live in our Church history as one of the very noblest of England's parish priests. But it was admitted<sup>1</sup>—it could not with truth be denied—that Hook's 'nature' was 'impulsive,' that 'of course he made many mistakes,' and that, 'as a thorough Englishman, who rather gloried in some English prejudices,' he 'took up, perhaps, more of a distinctly Protestant attitude than many of those who otherwise felt with him.' He had, indeed, much of the 'John Bull' in him, and it was sure to come out in the Church line of one so signally honest. His theological combativeness could take the roughest form; his hatred of Rome and of 'Romanizing tendencies' could disturb his judgment on points of history. He himself, we learn, expressed to his son an opinion that the *Church Dictionary* ought to be almost wholly re-written, 'if it was to be brought up to the level of modern requirements.' That son, the Rev. Walter Hook, with his brother-in-law, Prebendary Stephens (the accomplished biographer of St. Chrysostom), has accordingly, in this fourteenth edition, found it necessary or desirable to rewrite or 'completely recast many of the old articles, and to add many new ones.' With the aid of their contributors, they have greatly enriched and improved the book; we would specially call attention to the excellent work done by Mr. Stephens in the region of English Church history,<sup>2</sup> and to Mr. Ommanney's article on the Athanasian Creed; but we think that the recasting process might have been carried a little further—for instance, in the article on Justification. That article accentuates the difference between

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xii. pp. 278 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, he is not afraid to state the plain fact that 'the origin of the Church of England dates from the mission of Augustine,' that there was 'no direct continuity' between it, *as so founded*, and 'the early British Church,' and that the 'Celtic missionaries' who did so much for 'the conversion of England' are 'in no way to be regarded as representatives of the British Church' (p. 168).

England and Rome on this subject, with a sort of pugnacious emphasis which, after all, obscures an important distinction. The Anglican Church, we are told, 'admits that the inherent righteousness of sanctification is always consequentially present with the really justified, but refuses to it . . . even the least share in the procurement of justification,' which 'procurement' is due to Christ's 'extrinsic righteousness, appropriated by a faith which is forensically imputed by God' to the believer, 'instead of a righteousness which he himself possesses not.' One would think that at this time of day we had outgrown technicalities which ignore the cardinal question, Is a living and 'Pauline' faith, in its own nature, moral or not? There can surely be no doubt as to the answer; but the phrase 'faith as distinct from good *works*' has tended to produce confusion. Faith is separable from a series of such works, although, if it has time, it will produce them. But it is not separable from—or rather it is in itself—the principle of sanctification. For, being an act of true 'self-committal,' performed by the whole interior being, in response to, and by virtue of, the life-giving touch of Christ, it possesses a moral vitality which makes it what a mere mental *fiducia* could not be, acceptable and justifying. There is more help for a Christian student in Mr. Gore's brief tract, *A Word for Peace on Justification*, than in Dean Hook's polemical antitheses, which aim, no doubt, at securing a Divine truth, but clog it with figments of modern scholasticism.

We are obliged to say that several articles (such as those on 'Inspiration,' 'Intention,' 'Priest,' 'Propitiation,' 'St. John's Gospel,' 'Lord's Day,' 'Mortification,' 'Mystery,' 'Socinianism,' and 'The Bangorian Controversy') appear to us in various degrees inadequate. We would speak with all respect and tenderness of the memory of so good and learned a man as the late Prebendary Joyce, but it is unfortunate that his well-known 'fad' about the 'exarchal' authority of the see of Canterbury, as affirmed by 'the Council of Windsor,' should appear under the *imprimatur* of Dean Hook's two editors (p. 242). The reader is told, with due references to Wilkins, that it 'was confirmed by subsequent synods,' but he is not told that the supremacy claimed by Lanfranc for Canterbury was utterly annulled in the next century, and has ever since been non-existent.<sup>1</sup> But the most flagrant instance of in-

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1887, p. 123. It is affirmed by a very high authority that Lanfranc's claim rested on 'a series of papal letters of which there are no traces at an earlier time, and which can only be regarded as authentic on the extreme hypothesis of an irrational and



accuracy which has come before us relates to Scottish Church history. We are told that—

‘When, in 1689, the Scottish Convocation expelled the bishops, and resolved to abolish Episcopacy, the persecuted Church revised her Service-book’ (*i.e.* that of Charles I.), ‘and reintroduced it as it now stands’ (p. 601).

Then comes a notice of the principal variations from the English book, among which is mentioned ‘a special blessing of the water’ in holy baptism. We are next informed that—

‘The preface to the Ordinal’ (of this ‘Scottish Prayer-Book’) ‘contains a strong assertion of the continuity of the Scotch orders, and of the necessity of Episcopal ordination. But the latest Scotch Canons allow the use also of the English consecration prayer in the Communion.’

Our Northern readers, and not they alone, will wonder whether the writer of these lines had read the history of the Scottish Church since the Revolution, or examined the Scottish Communion Office or Canons, or, for that matter, had remembered the prayer in the English book for the sanctification of the baptismal water. That writer is a lady who bears an honoured name, and has written much better in regard to the English book; but the clerical editors might have been expected to make a point of revising what she had written, with a view to the correction of possible mistakes. It is curious that Prebendary Stephens, in his admirable paper on ‘The Church in Scotland’ (by which, of course, he means the *true* ‘sister Church’ in that country), refers to an article entitled ‘Scotch Communion Office,’ which appears somehow to have dropped out. In any such work as this, produced by the co-operation of various writers, there will be some disproportion in the treatment of subjects, and it will be difficult to avoid all inconsistencies; but in pp. 77, 778 the same writer speaks diversely as to the derivation of ‘Whitsunday.’ But it is a more serious matter when a mistranslation of the Nicene phrase *ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεις* by ‘a different person’ (actually adopted from Dean Stanley!) has to be corrected from the statement (p. 580) that *ὑπόστασις* was at that time used as equivalent to ‘substance,’ although, as is well known, it acquired, by transition of meaning, a ‘personal’ sense.

A leading characteristic of this dictionary is supplied by

continuous policy of double dealing on the part of the authorities of Rome.’ The title ‘Eboracensis,’ added to the name of Eadulf in his profession to Archbishop Æthelheard in 796, is a daring forgery; Eadulf was Bishop of Lindsey, not Archbishop of York.

the numerous contributions of Lord Grimthorpe, 'an old friend of Dr. Hook when vicar of Leeds' (Pref. p. iv). An eminently able lawyer, an acknowledged authority on bell-ringing and on architecture, and a 'Chancellor and Vicar-General of York,' may well be heard with attention on a wide range of subjects, among which, as we shall see, one important branch of theology must needs be included. But we must demur to his repetition of a very old complaint that the present form of Invocation in the Scottish Communion Office 'goes still further back towards transubstantiation' by substituting 'may become the Body' for 'may be to us the Body,' as in the Office of 1549 and 1637-1755.<sup>1</sup> And it is a little too much to be told that 'all our Prayer-Books since 1552 have had *no prayer for consecration at all*, but only the recital of the original words of institution of the Communion' (p. 178, under the head of 'Law of the Church in Scotland'). The petition, 'Hear us, O merciful Father,' &c., has always been regarded as an implicit petition for that sanctifying operation which alone can cause bread and wine to become the outward part of 'the Holy Sacrament.'<sup>2</sup> Prebendary Stephens takes a different view of the Scottish Office when, in the selfsame page, he describes it as 'in some respects conforming more closely than the English to primitive Catholic models.' In fact, the diversity of opinion between the editors and this particular contributor is one of the most curious features of the book. Lord Grimthorpe is permitted to say, in p. 555, that 'the Privy Council has twice decided the Advertisements to have been the "taking order by authority of the Queen," as provided for by her Act of Uniformity:' then comes, parenthetically, 'But see *Advertisements*,' and accordingly under that head Mr. Stephens accumulates evidence to show that the Advertisements were *not* such 'taking of other order' (p. 12). Elsewhere the sequence of correction is reversed: the article 'Altar'<sup>3</sup> justifies the Anglican use of that term for the Lord's Table, but straightway follows a parenthetical statement signed 'G.' beginning, 'Nevertheless it has been decided in the ecclesiastical courts that the Church of England has no altars,' &c. (p. 27). Again, the theory of a ceremonial *minimum* is applied to the Advertisements in p. 13; but in p. 208 'G.' reminds us that 'it has always been repudiated by the Privy Council, though it found favour with a late Dean of Arches,' and, we

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 357. The present Office is not, as 'G.' calls it, 'the second Scotch Service,' but rather the fourth.

<sup>2</sup> Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* ii. 139.

<sup>3</sup> Compare also the articles on 'Holy Table' and 'Lord's Table,' &c.

may add, though it is clearly supported by a comparison of the canons with the contemporary rubric, in regard to the frequency of cathedral Communion.<sup>1</sup>

There is another instance under the title 'North side.' Mr. Hook first gives reasons in favour of the interpretation which allows of the eastward position: then Lord Grimthorpe takes his turn. He begins in a tone of moderation: 'On the other hand, in the opinion of some, and according to certain legal decisions, "end" and "side" are the same.' But as he warms to his work he insists that 'standing anywhere else but at the north side,' in the sense of the north end, 'until the consecration prayer at any rate, is an absolute defiance of the plainest written law and decisions of the Supreme Court;' and as to the consecration, he upholds the dictum that 'before the table' means 'anywhere *at* the table,' and even quarrels with his beloved 'Supreme Court' in the Ridsdale judgment, because it relaxed the stringency of the Purchas judgment in that particular (p. 531).

Now we must say plainly that a Church Dictionary ought not thus flatly to contradict itself on important subjects; it should take one line or another. And although Lord Grimthorpe's aid may well have been valued by the editors, they would have done better to come to a previous understanding as to the use which he would make of his privilege as a favoured contributor. The readers of the *Guardian* know, indeed, how much he was aggrieved by the article on 'Affinity,' and we do not care to dwell on a few indications of that dictatorial scornfulness which he never can quite shake off in literary controversy, and which reminds us, against our will, of a browbeating counsel at the bar; for there is a good deal of his writing in this volume which does not illustrate his differences with High Churchmen, or his professional habit of regarding Privy Council decisions as an ultimate authority, and assuming that no one will venture to go behind them. He has much to tell us about styles of architecture: for instance, the admirers of the glorious minster on 'Lincoln's sovereign hill,' may like to know that, in his opinion, its central tower is 'the finest unspired tower in the world, and that its Angel-choir is generally reckoned our finest piece of architecture, though perhaps the choir of Ely inside is as fine' (p. 287). But on some matters of pressing urgency with regard to our Church's interests, Lord Grimthorpe keeps no terms with her opponents: his watchword seems to be, 'Have

<sup>1</sup> See, too, Perry's *Students Ch. Hist. Engl.* ii. 290.

at thee with a downright blow, as Bevis of Southampton fell upon Ascapart.' Observe the swing of his quarterstaff :

'Perhaps the most audacious forms in which disestablishment has been proposed are those of some eminent Dissenting preachers . . . (1) the proposal that they should have the same rights in our churches as the clergy have. They have never been able to explain what more right they could claim in the churches than Jews, Turks (Mahometans), infidels, and atheists. The other proposal (2) to abolish all articles and standards of faith . . . is practically worse ; for that is not disestablishing the Church of England, but destroying it' (p. 301).

'What Dissenters mean and want by disestablishing the Church is not liberty of doctrine, but simply robbery. . . . Though every kind of statistics proves that Churchmen contribute to all general charities, both civil and religious, and to schools, three times as much as all the Dissenters put together, the latter claim, and have in many cases got, equal or more control over them, and are now set upon destroying all voluntary schools because they are generally Church schools. They have succeeded, by the Education Act of 1870 and its successors, in making Churchmen who maintain their own schools pay a double tax. . . . Not long ago the Dissenters, or persons in the same interest, tried a lawsuit to prevent a new foundation of a Church of England college at Oxford, having destroyed already the ecclesiastical character of the old ones. And now they are themselves trying to establish one there, of which every professor shall declare on his appointment that he is a Dissenter from the Established Church, though with the still odder qualification that he believes every one of the principal doctrines of the Church down to infant baptism. . . . These people are making it plainer every day that modern Dissent is not theological, but only hatred of the Church' (p. 739).

#### Again, as to churchwardens' powers :

'Subject to' the legal 'limitations, the conduct of public worship undoubtedly lies with the incumbent of the church, both as to music and other things. Neither churchwardens nor organist have a right to interfere, or to act contrary to the orders of the incumbent, so long as they are not unlawful, and an organist would be at once condemned by the ecclesiastical court who did so, as churchwardens have been for interfering. Their only right is to complain to the ordinary' (p. 627).

'It has even been held that they must not themselves remove the most unquestionably illegal "ornament" introduced by the incumbent ; but the limits of their power in that respect have not yet been determined by the supreme ecclesiastical court'—meaning, of course, the Judicial Committee—(p. 201).

Although he is hostile to 'the episcopal veto,' and does not recognize the fact that its exercise in regard to 'ritual'

suits is an abnormal remedy for the abnormal evil of discredited 'ecclesiastical courts,' and although, moreover, he passes by the very real distinctions between the condition of affairs under the Court of Delegates and under the Judicial Committee, he denounces the Public Worship Regulation Act as probably 'the greatest failure and series of blunders ever enacted, even in ecclesiastical legislation,' and (as becomes an archbishop's vicar-general) is particularly severe on the 'usurpation' of appointments to the two provincial judgeships 'by the Prime Minister,' in case the two archbishops did not agree on one person within six months. This, he adds, is regarded by 'many of the clergy as destroying the ecclesiastical character of the provincial judge;' but, somewhat strangely, he passes over the abolition of those canonical guarantees of ecclesiastical fidelity, which are eminently necessary for an official who is to represent the archbishop as a spiritual judge. Lord Grimthorpe is a vigorous upholder of private patronage; but his intensely narrow legalism, as in some other cases, neglects objections which come from a higher standpoint of a moral kind.

'All patronage of livings arose from the foundation and endowment of churches by the proprietors of land; and the present patrons represent them, through whatever changes may have taken place. . . . It is the fashion now to talk of patronage as a "trust." Whether it may or may not be called so morally, there is certainly no legal authority for so treating it, and it is a mere metaphorical expression which cannot logically be made the basis of any argument, though it is too common to do so' (p. 569).

We need not point out that the moral aspect of patronage is not to be thus cavalierly put aside; and that patrons must not be content with a dry legal view of their obligations, if they are to maintain their position before the conscience of the Church. But we agree with Lord Grimthorpe's caustic comment on one infelicitous proposal:

'Sooner or later, any such "council of patronage" as Church reformers want is certain to end in being elected by a gradually more and more popular constituency, until it would end in our "priests being made" by, if not of, "the lowest of the people," and frequently the worst and the most likely to destroy the Church.'

We might refer also to Lord Grimthorpe's positive denial of the legality of any lay ministrations in *church*, beyond the function of—

'reading the lessons when desired by the incumbent or other proper authority. . . . It is part of the common law of the Church, that

laymen may not read the prayers, nor even the epistle and gospel, which are expressly ordered to be read by ministers; and of course they may not preach. The idea that bishops can license them to do these things in church has no legal foundation whatever' (p. 446; cf. p. 628).

He disallows, as illegal, the custom of 'a few cathedrals,' where the Litany is sung by two lay clerks; and observes that the word 'vicars,' in the canon on the Litany, must be understood to mean clergy (p. 451).

But Lord Grimthorpe's two papers on 'Miracles' and 'Rationalism' are in some sense more important than any of his other contributions. The former article, indeed, repeats the vulgar error that the evidence of our senses disproves the doctrine of transubstantiation, and it also reproduces that view of miracles which isolated them too much from other evidences. But it is opportune to be reminded, in words quoted from Dr. Salmon, that 'a non-miraculous Christianity is as much a contradiction as a quadrangular circle;' that the hostile argument from 'nature' and 'experience' involves the 'trickery of using those terms in double senses;' and that science has proved, and can prove, nothing against miracles, considered as extraordinary operations of the Creator of the laws of nature for 'a sufficient reason of His own.' He pursues the same line of thought in the other article, and assails the infidel Pharisaism which affects to look down on Christian morality, and which points to the immoralities and cruelties which have often disgraced Christianity. 'But such reasoning is absurd, unless they can show that the sins which they denounce are recommended, and not denounced, by the New Testament; and of course they cannot, and never even try' (p. 638).

The Appendix consists of a defence of the genuineness of those last verses of St. Mark which are disparaged, as Lord Grimthorpe complains, by a note in that Revised Version of the New Testament on which he has already 'fleshed his steel.' The effect, he contends, has been to produce 'some new and very striking evidence in favour of the received text and Authorized Version.' But we fail to see how Eusebius could have gained anything for Arianism by 'excluding from his edition of the New Testament (supposed to be represented by  $\kappa$  and B) one of the two gospel records of the Ascension,' to which miracle he more than once alludes in his *Ecclesiastical History*. This suggestion is not due to Dean Burgon or Dr. Scrivener, whom Lord Grimthorpe refers to as authorities on the subject.



The *Dictionary of Religion* is to a large extent biographical, and includes in its list of names thus commemorated several which but recently were borne by living men. Thus we hear that Mr. Maurice, in his youth, was 'indebted to Dr. Jackson for timely pecuniary aid.' Archbishop Tait, with whom Mr. Benham, the editor, was on terms of intimacy, is repeatedly mentioned; and we are told of a strange dictum of his, that Dr. Arnold, had he lived, would have been able to arrest the movement for the secularization of his university. Very cordial praise is given to the characters and the work of J. M. Neale, Charles Lowder, and Harriet Monsell. Mr. Keble's personal character is called 'singularly beautiful' (p. 1034). Dr. Pusey's teaching is said to have 'exerted more influence on the Church of England than any other of the present century, and to have given a new life and energy to religion in its corporate or Church capacity, as distinguished from the individual direction given by the Wesleyan movement' (p. 865). But the carefully explained meaning of Mansel's distinction between relative and absolute knowledge is not fairly recognized, but rather ignored. He is made to say, 'You cannot know God.' What he did say was, 'You cannot comprehend God;' a very different matter, as St. Basil pointed out in his controversy with the Anomœans.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Ewing is made more of than Bishop Forbes, a preference which we should have thought impossible for any true Churchman. The special interest in the career of 'William Palmer of Magdalen College' is missed. Looking to the great personages of history, one has to regret the superficial treatment of Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, and the extremely narrow and unsympathetic estimate of St. Anselm. Two columns are assigned to Eusebius of Samosata, but Eusebius of Nicomedia is left out. John Knox occupies a smaller space than Kingsley. Dunstan is very fairly treated. Bonner is not regarded as out of the scope of literary justice. Laud is, on the whole, very equitably appreciated, and we are told that 'his opponents did not recognize his wish to defend the Church equally against Romanism and Calvinism, nor their own tendency to ignore the Church's teaching while professing to be its members' (p. 609). Law's letters to Hoadley are mentioned in regard to the Bangorian controversy, but not in the account of their writer himself. Of Bishop Samuel Parker we read, 'It has been asserted that he was a Romanist;' but it is certain that in his last hours he refused the assistance of Roman priests.<sup>2</sup> The writer who has dashed off the notice

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* ccxxxiv.<sup>2</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, xxiv. 246.

of Pius II. would do well to read Professor Creighton;<sup>1</sup> and he who has described St. Wilfrid as *Archbishop* of York may be advised to look at Bede's Epistle to Egbert, the first actual archbishop of that see.

There are several inaccuracies on points of history. For instance, the last revision of the Prayer-Book is said to have been effected at the Savoy Conference (p. 267), or 'immediately afterwards by a committee of bishops,' Convocation not being mentioned, and the revision itself being described as consisting of 'a few alterations, such as the addition to the lessons of the story of Bel and the Dragon' (p. 935). In regard to clerical celibacy the story of Paphnutius at the Nicene Council is half told, the statement of an ancient usage forbidding marriage *after* ordination being left out (p. 218). There is a strange flight of fanciful credulity in the suggestion that St. Paul may have visited Trophimus at Arles, and been carried over by him into Britain (p. 382). The Calvinistic theory of the Eucharist is not distinguished from the Zwinglian (p. 638). Mr. Benham describes his standpoint as that of

'Orthodox Christianity as generally understood by intelligent members of the Church of England; but endeavour has been made to accurately and fairly describe [*sic*] doctrines and practices far removed from that, in a simply informative rather than a dogmatic spirit. As regards other Christian denominations, it has been deemed right that they should be described as they themselves would desire, and that their own views and reasons should be fairly given rather than any view taken of them by others' (*Preface*)—

a principle not carried out in regard to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, as to which Bishop Milner's statement is followed up by a long polemical extract from Bishop Hopkins, plentifully garnished with italics and small capitals. In reference to Anglican Church parties there is an evident determination to be equitable. The good services of Evangelicalism are recognized, together with its inevitable defects. Colenso is treated with somewhat excessive tenderness; and the proposal which Bishop Bickersteth and others have borrowed from him, as to receiving polygamist converts to baptism on the understanding that they shall be allowed, as Christians, to remain polygamists, is twice mentioned with implicit approval (pp. 252, 833).<sup>2</sup> In regard to Eschatology,

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii. 235 ff., 368 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The point to be clearly kept in view is, that by accepting baptism, men pledge themselves to observe the Christian law; that the Christian law does not recognize polygamy as marriage; and that we have no right to dispense with the Christian law.

the cases in which *αἰώνιος* is used with a limited meaning as regards visible things are alluded to (p. 401); but it is not added that *αἰώνιος* there indicates a condition lasting as long as the subject of which it is predicated will exist. Baptismal regeneration is plainly affirmed (p. 887), and the Gorham controversy is said to have resulted in 'a pretty general agreement' that the judgment of the Arches Court, from which Mr. Gorham appealed to the Privy Council, 'correctly embodied the doctrine of the Anglican Church' (p. 478). Even the phrase 'opus operatum' is vindicated in a sound sense, as—

'The Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England . . . hold that the Sacraments are the instruments through which God bestows His grace and power on the recipient, and that through them such grace is always bestowed, so long as there is faith and oneness with God's will. The absence of faith is the only barrier' (p. 762).<sup>1</sup>

The term 'oblations' in the Communion Office is twice explained to mean the elements of bread and wine (pp. 755, 758): an interpretation condemned by 'G.' in the *Church Dictionary*. The eastward position, especially in the act of consecration, is favoured (p. 360). The argument of the Privy Council from the Advertisements fares but ill at the hands of Mr. Benham.

'They have obtained a fictitious importance with respect to modern controversies, from the mistaken impression that they had the authority of the Crown; but it is now known that although Parker applied for that authority, and expected to obtain it, Cecil . . . absolutely refused to submit them to the Queen for her signature' (p. 15).

We are told in the Preface that 'special care has been taken with the articles dealing with those questions which are most keenly discussed at the present day, bearing on what has come to be known as the Great Controversy.' This statement is verified by the papers on 'Pantheism,' on 'Miracles,' on 'Revelation,' on 'Materialism,' on the 'Being of God,' on 'Prayer,' and on the 'Resurrection of Christ.' We could extract several excellent passages, but must content ourselves with referring to the remarks on Agnosticism (p. 474), on the repeated 'stumblings' of Materialism (p. 676), on the need of combining external with internal evidence (p. 703), on the antecedent probability that a living and moral God would hold intercourse with His creatures (p. 897), and on the failure of the Vision theory as applied to the events of the

<sup>1</sup> Compare Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, p. 130.

first Eastertide (p. 894). The calm and serious tone, the fairness of statement, the orderly and luminous method in these specimens of Apologetic, deserve the highest admiration.

The *Dictionary of the Church of England* is a much smaller book than either of the two others before us. It may be recommended as a useful compendium of ecclesiastical information, worthy, on the whole, of the *imprimatur* of the S.P.C.K. Tract Committee, but needing some little revision and the correction of some misprints. It may be consulted with advantage on such important matters as 'Inspiration,' 'Latitudinarianism,' the 'Causes of Dissent,' the sense attached to 'the Royal Supremacy' in the Reformation period, the degrees of affinity under 'Matrimony,' 'Transubstantiation' as capable of a more refined or a coarser interpretation, and the relations of 'Church and State,' as to which the Bishop of Chester has been followed (p. 160 ff.). Great attention has been paid to the history of the English Church and of its several dioceses, though there is a want of proportion in the treatment of the latter—Lichfield and Norwich, for instance, filling a considerably larger amount of space than Lincoln. There are convenient lists of events in due chronological order. But we must suggest the reconsideration of the statements made in p. 198 on the subject of Convocation, which is said to have been at first organized as a engine of systematic taxation. For 'organized' read 'utilized.' The distinction drawn between ancient 'Synods' and 'Convocations' is unhistorical, as a reference to Wilkins would show.<sup>1</sup> 'Convocation' is an ecclesiastical term for an English synod; and, in the words of a committee of the Lower House of Canterbury, the Provincial Synod and the Convocation 'are designated by the same name, transacted the same business, were composed of the same elements, and were called by the same authority.'<sup>2</sup> It is also incorrect to apply the name of synods to the 'Pan-Anglican' conferences of bishops (p. 440). The Sarum Ordinary and Canon of the Mass are given in Mr. Pearson's translation (p. 401); but the suggestion that 'Mass' may have been derived from the Saxon *mæsse* or feast is futile, in view of such a term as 'mass-priest' for a presbyter. Of course it is *missa* in an Anglicized form. The Communion Service of 1549 is also given, as well as the Order for Administration of the Communion put forth in 1548. The account of the various 'Ritual Judgments' is incomplete. The Ad-

<sup>1</sup> *Concilia*, i. 408, 723, 726.

<sup>2</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxiv. 468 ff.

188  
ven  
Eli  
the  
was  
was  
the  
exa  
Par  
pro  
the  
It is  
mea  
to b  
is q  
hint  
eye  
may  
Arch  
the g  
I

1  
Diction  
whom  
would  
have t  
in 166  
object  
as it c  
the bi  
centur  
rubric  
ence lo  
self, in  
'such  
the wo  
the Pra  
basis.  
were c  
the sar  
Grimth  
one wh  
that, sh  
rubric  
vol. xvi  
word 'r  
1604, h  
minister  
adhered  
subject  
93, 129,

vertisements are correctly described as proceeding from the Elizabethan bishops; and it is significantly observed that at the last revision of the Prayer-Book 'the Ornaments Rubric was retained with just so much alteration as showed that it was not retained by inadvertence, or as a mere dead form; the alteration was to make the words of the rubric agree exactly, which it had not originally done, with the Act of Parliament' (that is, omitting the qualifying clause which provided for the taking of 'other order'). This is, of course, the explanation of the term 'retained' in our present rubric. It is simply copied from the Elizabethan statute.<sup>1</sup> The well-meant suggestion that some distinctive Eucharistic vestment to be allowed by canon 'might be restricted to white' (p. 611), is quite out of date under present circumstances. Another hint, that if bishops should take to 'ornate' copes, 'the public eye will get accustomed to a handsome Eucharistic vestment,' may be emphasized by the appearance presented by the two Archbishops and the Dean and Canons of Westminster at the great Jubilee Service of last June.

It should be added that this *Dictionary* is full and minute

<sup>1</sup> We may here notice a statement of Lord Grimthorpe, in the *Church Dictionary*, p. 11. 'The more Protestant majority of the bishops to whom it' (the subject of revision) 'was referred after the Savoy conference would not let Cosin and Sancroft, who were of the High Church party, have their way in all things' (is Sancroft supposed to have been a bishop in 1661?); 'and in particular, the Puritans at the conference having objected that the Jacobean rubric "seemed to bring back the vestments," as it certainly did, the old word "retained" was afterwards reinstated by the bishops, so as to bring back nothing that had then vanished for a century, both actually and legally. . . . The word "retained" (in the rubric as thus reworded) 'involved the inquiry of what was then in existence legally and actually.' Unfortunately for this hypothesis, Cosin himself, in corrections noted down by him before 1661, proposed to read 'such ornaments shall be retained,' &c., manifestly in order to substitute the wording of the statute of 1559 for the technically illegal wording of the Prayer-Book of 1559, and so to place the 'ornaments' on a surer basis. He also proposed to omit the qualifying clause. Both points were carried in the revision. 'Retained,' therefore, in 1661-2, had just the same significance which it had in 1559, and no other. On Lord Grimthorpe's interpretation, a new significance is imported into it, and one which would make it to a large extent self-stultifying. For evidence that, shortly after the revision, Nonconformists objected strongly to the rubric as still legalizing the vestments, see *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xvii. p. 66. As for Lord Grimthorpe's assertion that the important word 'retained' was 'illegally omitted in the Jacobean Prayer-Book' of 1604, he must have forgotten that Elizabeth's Prayer-Book read, 'The minister . . . shall use such ornaments,' and this reading was simply adhered to through the reigns of her two successors. On the whole subject see Parker's *Introduction to the Revisions of B. of C. P.*, pp. 44, 93, 129, 345, 402.

on the affairs of Dissenting communities ; and we wish we could see any ground for the hope, expressed at p. 397, of a corporate return of the Wesleyans to the Church. To us this hope appears but a pious dream.<sup>1</sup>

One of the attractive features of the book consists in its numerous woodcuts, representing bishops and monks of different orders, figures from old manuscripts, or interesting specimens of architecture.

---

#### ART. IV.—FRANCIS OF ASSISI AND THE RENAISSANCE.

*Franz von Assisi und die Anfänge der Kunst der Renaissance in Italien.* Von HENRY THODE. (Berlin : 1885.)

THE life of St. Francis of Assisi is one of those subjects which prove attractive to writers of the most opposite schools of thought, and seem to have a peculiar fascination for the scholars and thinkers of the present day. No doubt this is partly owing to the great and increasing interest felt by the modern inquirer in tracing the progressive steps of human civilization and in discovering the links which bind one age to another. But it is even more due to the indescribable charm of Francis himself, and to the wonderful simplicity and courage with which he tried to realize the high ideal of Christian life set before him in the Gospels. Catholic and Protestant, believer and sceptic alike, own the beauty of the man's character, and express their admiration with the same fervent enthusiasm. 'If ever a man has deserved the name of saint,' exclaims the latest biographer of Francis, himself a German Lutheran, 'that man is Francis of Assisi.' If indeed, as a living poet<sup>2</sup> sings, love is 'the sole good in life'; if—

'Life, with all it yields of joy and woe,  
And hope and fear,  
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,  
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is'—

then Francis nobly fulfilled the end for which he was created. Within the last few years several important works have

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xix. pp. 293-5.

<sup>2</sup> R. Browning.



been devoted to the history of St. Francis and the consideration of the influence which he exercised on his own times and on succeeding generations. There have been M. Renan's thoughtful chapter in his *Nouvelles Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse* (Paris: 1884); Ruggiero Bonghi's admirable biography, published in the same year; Hermann Hettner's short but suggestive essay, *Die Franciscaner in der Kunstgeschichte*, which also appeared in 1884; and the finely-illustrated *Vie de Saint François d'Assisi*, published at Paris in 1885 by Plon, besides several other works of inferior merit which the seventh centenary of the Saint's birth called forth. And now another German scholar, Dr. Henry Thode, of Berlin, gives us a volume of 600 pages on Francis of Assisi and the Early Art of the Italian Renaissance, which, in point of learning and critical penetration, surpasses all previous works on the subject. It forms a worthy companion to Marchese's two volumes on the influence which the Dominicans exercised on the development of Art, an influence which Dr. Thode seems too much inclined to disparage.<sup>1</sup>

Following in the steps of Hettner and Springer, Dr. Thode has tried to show the intimate relationship that exists between the revival of art in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and the teaching and practice of Francis and his followers—between the Franciscans on one hand and the early Florentine painters on the other. In his eyes Francis of Assisi is the representative of a great movement of Western Christendom—a movement by no means confined to the Church, but universal in the truest sense of the word. This movement, which Dr. Thode defines as the movement of humanity, began in the twelfth century to culminate in the preaching of Francis, about 1200, and lasted until the middle of the fourteenth century, to be succeeded by the revival of learning and the Reformation. The true principle of this movement was the revived sense of individuality, which, breaking through the old trammels, once more boldly asserted its rights. The results of this recovered freedom soon appeared in the rapid rise of the citizen class, and in the blossoming of art and poetry which followed rapidly upon its steps. But the living representative of the movement that was to bring about such wonders—the man who first proclaimed the gospel of humanity and the rights of each individual soul before God and man—was Francis of Assisi. Accordingly it is Dr. Thode's

<sup>1</sup> See *Memorie dei più insigni Pittori, Scultori e Architetti Domenicani, con aggiunta di alcuni Scritti intorno le belle Arti del P. L. Vinc. Marchese dello stesso Istituto.* 2 vols., Florence, 1845, 1846.

aim to set Francis before us in his true light, less as a saint and reformer of the Church than as the awakener who first stirred the soul of Italy and thus became the creator of a new Christian art. So the revival of letters and of the fine arts in the fourteenth century are alike to be traced back to the foundation of the order of the Brothers Minor, and the history of the Italian Renaissance must begin with Francis of Assisi.

The idea is not a new one, and in bringing it before the world Dr. Thode does not lay claim to any special originality. The great influence exerted by the Mendicant orders, especially by the Franciscans in the beginning of the Florentine Renaissance, has been insisted on of late years by more than one writer, both English and German. But never before has the thought been worked out so fully, never has the extraordinary influence which the personality of Francis, and the far-reaching results which his changed conceptions of God and nature produced in contemporary art, been so completely, so convincingly set forth. We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Thode's *History of Francis of Assisi and the Early Italian Renaissance* is one of the most valuable and important contributions to the history of the period which have appeared in recent years, and should be attentively read by all who are interested in the art of the early Florentines, and more especially in that of Giotto, whose frescoes have been the object of Dr. Thode's most careful and minute study.

It is easy to see that in the book before us, as the author tells us, we have the result of years of labour. Neither time nor pains have been spared to add to its completeness. During a prolonged residence in Italy, Dr. Thode visited not only the scenes among which St. Francis spent his life, but all the principal churches and convents of his order. He became familiar alike with the frescoes and pictures, and with the architecture of churches inspired by Franciscan influences. He made laborious researches in the archives of the great convent at Assisi, and explored all that remains to us of Franciscan poetry and literature. We may not always agree with his conclusions, but we must all listen with respect to his opinion, and must recognize the authority with which he speaks on questions upon which he has bestowed so much thought and consideration. And if the vast amount of material thus brought together has not been in some instances sufficiently sifted and condensed, if in his anxiety to make his meaning clear the author occasionally repeats himself, and mars the effect of his work, it is a fault which his readers will readily forgive for the sake of the brightness and animation of the style in which his book

is w  
a lab  
in th  
hom  
dawn  
the  
of th  
temp  
work  
there  
great  
aim,  
home  
to Fi  
order  
to As  
fresh  
which  
condi  
and r  
book  
the g  
D  
with  
count  
under  
hands  
these  
mode  
by Th  
The L  
The L  
of the  
carefu  
in the  
Wadd  
ground  
of St.  
Hase,  
source  
of Cel  
manda  
Genoa  
writer  
made

is written. For the task has been, it is plain, from first to last a labour of love, and a real enthusiasm and a genuine delight in the subject breathes in every page. It was at Assisi, the home of St. Francis, that the first idea of his great work dawned on the author's mind. There, as he read again the simple tales of the old legends in the sweet language of the *Fioretti*, as he spent hours, nay days, in silent contemplation of the frescoes on the walls about him, the life and work of Francis appeared to him in a new light. Standing there in the mighty double church which has risen above the great Saint's resting-place, the meaning of this man's ideal aim, of his boundless love for all God's living creatures, came home to him with new force, and the link which bound Giotto to Francis, the young art of Tuscany to the teaching of his order, became suddenly clear to him. Each time he returned to Assisi after fresh wanderings through Tuscany and Umbria, fresh researches into the art and literature of the age to which Francis belonged, his knowledge of the man and the conditions under which he lived and worked became fuller and more intimate, until at length he went home to write the book which was to help the world to a better understanding of the great Saint's character and place in history.

Dr. Thode's work is divided into two parts, the first dealing with Francis himself, the second with his followers. This account of the Saint's life is based on four original sources which undergo a most searching and rigorous examination at his hands, in an appendix printed at the end of the book. Of these four authorities, three have been generally made use of by modern writers. First, we have the *Life of St. Francis*, written by Thomas of Celano three years after his death; secondly, *The Legend of the Three Companions*, written in 1246; thirdly, *The Life of St. Francis*, written by Bonaventura by command of the order in 1261. These three original biographies were carefully edited by the Bollandist father, Constantine Suysken, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, i., ii. (1786), and compared with Luke Wadding's notices in the *Annals* of the Order, and formed the groundwork of Mrs. Oliphant's popular and appreciative sketch of St. Francis, and of the more critical work by Dr. Karl Hase, which appeared some years earlier. To these original sources Dr. Thode adds a fourth in the second *Life* by Thomas of Celano, written between 1244 and 1246, in obedience to a mandate of the general chapter of the order which met at Genoa in the former year. This second *Life*, which was written before that of the *Three Companions*, and was largely made use of by Bonaventura in his narrative, seems to have

been overlooked by later biographers. Bonghi, writing in 1884, drew attention to this forgotten work, which had been published at Rome in 1806. Dr. Thode was the first to see and appreciate its importance. Written as a supplement to Thomas of Celano's former Life of Francis, it is valuable not only as giving fuller details of the latter part of the Saint's life, but also as supplying much that is of the deepest interest respecting the character and habits of Francis, his practice of virtue, his love of nature, his devotional exercises, and his style and manner of preaching.

All these different sources of information are critically examined and collated by Dr. Thode, who is thus enabled to enrich his account of Francis with many new and interesting particulars. Amongst other points worthy of notice, he tells us that the true name of the Saint's mother, Madonna Pica, as his biographers call her, was Piccarda de Bourlemont, or Beaumont, and that she belonged to a noble family of Provence, and had probably married the wealthy merchant of Assisi on one of his journeys through Northern France. This explains the love which Bernardino's youthful son had for Provençal poetry, and the habit, which we are told he retained all his life, of singing in French. To his familiarity as a child with the French language, Thomas of Celano ascribes the surname of 'Il Francesco,' which, first given him in jest by his companions, in time took the place of his baptismal name of Giovanni.

Several dates in the history of Francis have also been rectified by Dr. Thode's researches. His birth is fixed in the year 1181—a date, we believe, now generally accepted—while his conversion is placed in 1206, when he was twenty-five years old, and the call to preach the Kingdom of Heaven, which led to the foundation of his order, three years later. The formal recognition of the new order and sanction of the rule did not take place until January 30, 1223; but it seems probable that, both in 1209 and in 1216, Francis visited Rome, and received the verbal approval of Pope Innocent and Honorius III. Lastly, the gift of Monte Alvernia, which Francis received from Orlando, Count of Chiusi, was not made in 1212, as Wadding says in his *Annals*, but in 1224, when, only two years before his death, he and his three brothers spent the Lent of St. Michael in solemn retreat on the mountain heights, and in his cell under the spreading beech-tree he beheld the wondrous vision of the Crucified and received the marks of the Sacred Wounds.

Dr. Thode has himself made a pilgrimage to Mount

A  
spe  
of

Da  
the  
the  
and  
for  
flow  
thin  
La  
foll  
poss  
Flo  
that  
of I  
plac

surre  
Like  
desol  
steep  
rocks  
brigh  
rests  
creat  
green  
up th  
blue  
yearn  
count  
it is g  
Saint

F  
which  
gate,  
the c  
built,  
Coun  
curior

Alvernia, or La Vernia, as it is more commonly called, and speaks in glowing terms of this famous sanctuary in the heart of the Casentino:—

‘Nel crudo sasso intra Tevere ed Arno,  
Da Cristo prese l’ultimo sigillo  
Che le sue membra du’ anni portarno.’

Dante’s lines are in the mind of every traveller who climbs the rugged steep. That great yoke of Apennine, which parts the waters of Arno from those of Tiber rises high on the right, and from the green slopes on either side the glittering rills, for whose cool stream the forger Adam thirsted in hell-fire, flow down into the plains. And Dante’s city, we are glad to think, has not been unmindful of the sacred Mount. To-day La Vernia is one of the few convents in Italy where the followers of Francis are suffered to remain in undisturbed possession of their home; and once a year the banner of the Florentine Gonfaloniere is still hoisted on the walls, in token that the community is under the protection of the Signoria of Florence. But let us hear Dr. Thode’s description of the place:—

‘Not far from Bibbiena the mountain of Alvernia rises above the surrounding hills, and commands a wide view over the fruitful valley. Like all the places dear to Francis, Alvernia is remarkable for the desolate grandeur of its scenery. The mountain-top falls away in steep, splintered crags to the lower heights, which lift their barren rocks on either side. Above, mighty beeches, clad in the freshest, brightest green, mingle with the pine-woods . . . all around the eye rests on the arid slopes of the Apennines. It is a spot, as it were, created to uplift and detach the soul, whether we look on the radiant green of the pastures at the foot of these precipitous walls of rock, or up through the slender boughs of the trees into that unfathomable blue towards which the heart of man has for ever gone out in silent yearning. And up there the birds sing as if they had all left the countryside to seek shelter on the mountain of Francis. . . . Truly it is good to be there; and, of all places where the memory of the Saint is still cherished, this one is the most beautiful.’<sup>1</sup>

Further on Dr. Thode describes the group of buildings which have risen on this hallowed spot. Through the low gate, ‘which frames in a whole world of loveliness,’ we enter the courtyard, where the little Church of the Angels stands, built, says an ancient tradition, by Francis himself, or by Count Orlando after a design supplied by the Saint, and curiously resembling the Chapel of the Portiuncula at Assisi.

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 51, 52.

In 1264 the Church of the Stigmata arose on the very spot where the cell of Francis stood under the beech-tree; and a century later the third great church, completed by the Florentine Clothiers' Guild, which now forms the central point of the irregular and picturesque group of buildings. A long gallery adorned with later paintings leads along the steep mountain-side, connecting the different chapels with the convent, and several magnificent altars by Andrea della Robbia and his followers adorn the three churches, the finest of all—a Crucifixion with Peruginesque angels flying in the air, and a figure of Francis standing at the foot of the Cross—belonging to the Chapel of the Stigmata. In speaking of the Stigmata itself, the truth of which Dr. Hase felt necessary to scrutinize with so much severity, the present writer remarks that, at the present time, critical inquiry is as impossible as it would be fruitless. It is true that the fact rests on the testimony of Elias, who alone of the order claimed to have seen the sacred marks; but, on the other hand, the belief in their existence was universal among the followers and friends of Francis. How much in their story is found upon truth, and how much is the invention of their fancy, Dr. Thode owns that he is not greatly concerned to ask.

'When all has been said, the fact remains that under this image one man understands what the other believes, namely, that the days which Francis spent on Mount Alvernia mark the culminating point in his spiritual life. Then, in an ecstasy of prayer and celestial rapture, he realised the fulness of union with Christ in his life and sufferings, and, fired with seraphic ardour, this soul rose to heights which we may dimly picture to ourselves, but cannot attempt to describe.'<sup>1</sup>

One interesting fragment which Dr. Thode has brought to light, and which he introduces at this point of his story, is the touching farewell which Francis bade to Monte Alvernia as, mounted on the ass lent him by Count Orlando, he descended the steep hillside, conscious, in his failing strength, that he should never again see this spot he had loved so well. These words, which bear a strong likeness to several passages in the *Fioretti*, are said to have been preserved by Fra Masseo, one of the companions of Francis on this his last journey, and may at least express the feelings that thrilled the heart of the dying Saint, while they account for the peculiar affection with which his followers regarded Alvernia in later days.

In his next chapter Dr. Thode considers the character of

<sup>1</sup> P. 54.



Francis, and endeavours to explain the extraordinary love and veneration felt for him by those among whom he lived. All that the old historians have told us of his gentleness to weaker brethren, of his loving pity for the erring soul, and of his beautiful tenderness for dumb creatures, is here brought together. We hear how he tended the leper, and toiled with his own hands to earn bread for the needy ; how he sold his book of the Gospels to buy food for a hungry woman ; how he preached to the birds on Mount Alvernia, and fed the bees with honey through the winter, and called the cicala his sister ; how he bade the woodman spare half the tree that it might shoot forth again, and told the gardener to plant sweet-smelling and bright-coloured flowers which would speak to all of the Divine loveliness. How, too, the dumb animals loved and followed him ; how the hunted hare sought refuge in his lap ; how the redbreasts picked up crumbs on his table, and the pheasant nestled at his side ; how the falcon on the steep of Alvernia woke him to pray, and the swallow hovered round his bedside and sang him to sleep when his last hour came.

‘In the whole of nature he recognized the face of God, in beauty saw the Most Beautiful. All that was good spoke to him with one voice, saying : He who made us is the greatest and best. Everywhere he found his Beloved, and things earthly became a ladder on which he climbed to the Throne of God.’<sup>1</sup>

So writes Thomas of Celano in his supplementary record. He, too, it is who tells us how this overflowing love and joy broke forth into sweet melody, and that he sang the praises of his Lord in the French tongue, accompanying himself on the viola ; how, too, when he had no instrument at hand, he would make himself a bow with a stick and a piece of thread, and sang to this accompaniment. ‘Often these verses would end in tears, and his joy was turned into weeping over the sorrows of the Lord.’<sup>2</sup> But Francis, we know, poured forth the glowing love of his heart, not only in French song, but also in his own native language. Then for the first time, say the old chroniclers, the praise of God was heard in the vulgar tongue of Italy, and as he lay dying he composed the beautiful Hymn of Creation, that canticle to the rising sun in which the whole being of the man finds its best and truest expression.

This enthusiasm of love it was which worked such marvels in his preaching. The rude, untaught peasants and townspeople flocked to hear these simple words spoken with such

<sup>1</sup> P. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas, II. *Leg.* iii. 67.

impassioned force, and their hearts melted with love and pity towards the Lord of whom he told them, the Christ who was their Friend and their Brother. Two great truths which had up to this time been too much lost sight of, the equality of all men in the sight of God, and the personal relation of each single individual to his Maker, were now publicly proclaimed by Francis and his followers with the sanction of the Church. This message, which the brothers of the new order bore, was gladly received by the growing population of the towns. Instead of seeking remote regions for their convents they settled in the very heart of the cities. As the towns increased in wealth and importance, the Franciscans also increased in numbers. The vast concourse of people who flocked to hear them preach led to the rise of new churches and convents, in every town and village. These in their turn created a new and sudden demand for pictorial decoration, and so, Dr. Thode argues, out of the relations between the new order and the burgher class the modern artist arose.

The naturally artistic capacity of the Tuscan race, and the outward circumstances of the moment, were both no doubt favourable to the rise of this new Christian art. The ground on which the seed fell was good. The sun and rain were not wanting. But still the sower of the word was Francis. His example and his teaching it was which supplied the needful impulse. The enthusiasm of his new Gospel, borne abroad by a band of inspired teachers, stirred the hearts of the people and bore fruit in a thousand different forms.

The next portion of Dr. Thode's work is devoted to the consideration of these results. The first examines the direct influence which Francis himself had upon art. Under this head, he treats, in the first place, of the reputed portraits of the Saint himself, and next of the representations of legendary incidents in his life. The love and veneration for his memory, which found expression in his canonization only two years after his death, naturally prompted the wish to recall the features of the beloved master. Accordingly, we find that many portraits of St. Francis, by the hand of rude artists of the thirteenth century, have been preserved in convents and churches of his order. Of these the oldest and most authentic is a fresco painted in the year 1228 in the *Sacro Speco* of Subiaco, which commemorates the visit paid by the Saint six years earlier to this great Benedictine sanctuary. The decree of canonization had as yet not been promulgated, and the Saint of Assisi is here simply '*Frater Franciscus*,' without the halo about his brow, or the marks of

the Stigmata in his hands. He wears the brown habit of his order, with a knotted rope fastened round his waist, and the hood tightly drawn over his forehead. The hair and beard are fair, as in all his portraits—in curious contradiction to his biographer's positive statement—but with this exception, the oval type of face and regular features, the fine eyes and gentle, benign expression, agree well with Thomas of Celano's description. Other portraits belonging to the first half of the century exist at San Francesco in Ripa in Rome, in the baptistery of Parma, and elsewhere, but these were all painted after 1228. These early portraits, however, are all very similar in character, and it is only in the later representations that we find the hollow cheeks and emaciated features which betray the wish to reconcile the appearance of Francis with the popular notion of sanctity then prevalent. This ascetic element is strongly marked in both the oldest portraits of Francis preserved at Assisi, the one in the sacristy of the great church long ascribed to Cimabue, and now without more reason given to Giunta da Pisa, and the other at Santa Maria degli Angeli, which Dr. Thode considers to be the work of an Umbrian artist who flourished in the latter half of the sixteenth century. In these and other contemporary portraits Francis generally bears a crucifix in one hand, and a book of the Gospels open at the words, 'Si vis perfectus esse, vade vende omnia quæ habes et da pauperibus.' In some instances he is represented kneeling at the foot of the Cross, as in Margaritone's large fresco at Arezzo. Cimabue repeated the generally accepted type with greater technical skill and a slightly more successful attempt at reality. Giotto, breaking with old tradition after his wont, was the first to represent the Saint as youthful and beardless, and to create a new ideal type of his own. In the hands of later masters Francis became the type of passionate devotion and religious ecstasy, whether they represent him gazing lost in rapture on the Child Christ in His mother's arms, or standing with Magdalen and St. John at the foot of the Cross. Countless are the famous works of art in which we meet with his ascetic face and uplifted eyes. Raphael gives him a prominent place in his 'Madonna di Foligno,' contrasting his attitude and expression, as has been often done, with that of St. John the Baptist; Giorgione introduces him in his peerless 'Virgin of Castelfranco'; Titian in his 'Madonna di Pesaro'; Correggio in his great altar-piece at Dresden. With the more spiritual painters, Perugino and Francia, he is naturally a favourite subject, as he is also with the Della Robbia sculptors, while

no one loved to paint him better, or succeeded more entirely in catching his spirit, than the Dominican artist, Fra Angelico.

The representations of the life of Francis during the greater part of the thirteenth century were limited to small subjects painted on gold ground on the panels round his portrait, and deal exclusively with the miraculous incidents of his legend, such as the Stigmata, and the different miracles of healing the sick and raising the dead attributed to his intercession. The oldest which Dr. Thode can discover is Berlinghieri's panel picture at Pescia, dated 1235. The first of any importance is the series of half-destroyed frescoes in the nave of the Lower Church at Assisi. These five scenes represent Francis leaving his father's home, the vision of Pope Innocent III., who in the dream sees Francis upholding the tottering Church, Francis preaching to the birds, the Stigmata, and death of the Saint. They belong, it is clear, to the latter half of the century, and, according to Dr. Thode, were the work of the unknown Umbrian painter who executed the portrait of the Saint at Santa Maria degli Angeli, and whom our author, for want of a better name, styles the master of Francis. There is a marked advance in these frescoes, rude and injured as they are, a degree of life and expression in the gestures and faces, which bear witness to the awakening of a new feeling for nature. But it is not till we come to Giotto that we realize all that art owes to Francis. The twenty-eight scenes from the life of the Saint on the lower walls of the nave in the Upper Church of Assisi reveal the Florentine master in all the vigour of youthful freshness and genius, and herald the dawn of the new and glorious day that was coming. But they show also the priceless value of the new material which the young reformer found ready to his hand. Here was a whole cycle of legendary incident which tradition had not yet stamped with its conventional mark, but which was altogether new and fresh, free to be shaped according to his own fancy—a series of subjects full of picturesque incident and dramatic situations, which lent itself admirably to artistic representation. The life of Francis had been lived here in this very city of Assisi in the valley of Tiber. He did not belong to some far-off remote past, but to their own age and time. He was their countryman, their fellow-citizen, their own dearly loved friend and brother. He had walked up and down these dusty streets, sharing their daily toil and cares; he had known the joy of their joys, and had shared the sorrow of their sorrows. To tell the story of his life and to set before men any living representation of these familiar scenes, it was necessary to

stu  
and  
wh  
wat  
ma  
dou  
the  
pic  
the  
fort  
wor

clos  
are  
cann  
well  
riper  
the c  
of S  
to s  
neces  
with  
foll  
sculp  
and  
meth  
surpa  
dajo'  
with  
move  
Santa  
positi  
introc  
Franc  
the p  
cross  
broth  
others  
white  
all, lo  
of ang  
soul h  
Tr  
as this  
ther, a

study actual life very closely and attentively. The men and women of the town, Francis and Chiara, the nobleman who falls dead at his table, the thirsty peasant for whom water gushes from the rock, the angry father, and the terrified magician must be real, living persons. Hope and fear and doubt, every shade of joy and grief and wonder, must find their place here, and be all in turn truthfully depicted on these pictured walls. The opportunity was a splendid one, and the right man to make use of it was not wanting. At this fortunate hour the young Giotto came to Assisi, and a new world was opened to art.

In this great cycle of frescoes which he painted in the closing years of the thirteenth century his creative powers are revealed for the first time in all their fulness. We cannot follow Dr. Thode in his minute analysis of those well-known works, and of those still nobler frescoes of his riper years, in which the great master once more took up the old theme and painted the story of Francis on the walls of Santa Croce of Florence. It is enough for our purpose to say that Giotto's conception supplied the type for all necessary representations of the legend, and were repeated with scarcely any variation in Franciscan churches by his followers during the next hundred years. The painters and sculptors of the fifteenth century added a few new scenes, and brought their larger knowledge and improved technical methods to bear upon the old subjects, but few among them surpassed the older master's original conceptions. Ghirlandajo's fine 'Death of Francis' in the church of the Trinità, with all its skilful perspective and realistic details, does not move us nearly so much as Giotto's rendering of the scene in Santa Croce. Nothing can well be simpler than the composition of this beautiful fresco. Only a few figures are introduced, but these are sufficient to tell the whole story. Francis lies dead on his low pallet; at his head and feet stand the priests who have come to perform the last rites, bearing cross and book in their hands; about him are the weeping brothers, some giving vent to their grief in distracted gestures, others kissing the dead hands or gazing tenderly on the still white face; while one, the smallest and most insignificant of all, looks up suddenly and points wonderingly to the vision of angels, who, floating heavenwards through the air, bear the soul home to God.

Truly, as Dr. Thode says, no artist was ever so well fitted as this one to be the painter of Francis. He goes even further, and declares that, whoever would arrive at a thorough

understanding of the Saint's character, and realize the manner and extent of his influence on his age, must begin with an intimate knowledge of Giotto's frescoes.

In the third section of his work Dr. Thode gives us a long and learned history of the great double church of St. Francis at Assisi, which to many persons will prove the most valuable and interesting part of the book. He begins with an eloquent description of Assisi itself, the old grey town which slumbers on the mountain heights, and, careless of the present, seems to dream of her great past, and let the world go by.

Since 1500 the great church of Francis has been scarcely touched, and remains one of the noblest monuments of ecclesiastical architecture in Italy, offering a peculiar attraction to pilgrims of the most different kind. The admiration which the boldness of its construction rouses in the heart of the traveller, who, standing on the Piazza at Perugia, sees the first dim outline of the mighty church clinging to the mountain-side, increases with every step as he journeys through the blooming valley and ascends the steep path which leads to the city of holy Francis. There lies Assisi, a thin, long grey streak of houses half way up the silvery olive-green hill, at the foot of the bare crags of Monte Subasio. Above the town rise the ruined walls and towers of the ancient fortress, telling of old days in which a warlike race, strong in love as in hate, after kneeling at the altar devoutly, and hearing words of peace from its Apostle, went forth, sword in hand, to defend the town against its foes. Towards the east the houses gather round the high roofs and the slender bell-towers of the churches. Yonder is the old Duomo of Rufinus, yonder the big market-place with the communal palace. But the eye does not linger there long. It is ever turning westward to the far end, where, on the edge of the falling cliff, resting on its long row of mighty arches, the church of Francis lifts its sharp gable and lofty bell-tower into the blue skies. Here lies the true centre of Assisi, and towards this point houses and churches seem to move in solemn procession along the hillside. . . . And when big and small bells ring out through the city, the deep-toned bell of St. Francesco makes itself heard above the voices of all the rest; then a strange sense of forgetfulness both of time and space comes over the wanderer, never again to leave him while he tarries in this city which lives upon its memories. For silent and deserted are the streets—whether we tread the steep and winding alleys of the town or the chief street which leads from Francesco to the Piazza. No living being seems to stir behind these cold grey walls; only now and then a girl goes to fetch water from the fountain, or a black priest or brown friar crosses the road. The footsteps of strangers and pilgrims bring the only change in the monotonous life of the forgotten town, and these care little for Assisi itself, and have only come to see the church of Francis.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 190, 191.

188  
inef  
leav  
with  
low  
atm  
jour  
glea  
is b  
prop  
wind  
asce  
visio  
cont  
tion  
reare  
burie  
owin  
admi  
diffic  
natel  
death  
know  
to wh  
writen  
is to b  
histor  
writte  
expre  
builde  
Filipp  
archite  
before  
of the  
Certai  
Assisi  
and V  
show t  
lead ou  
bard or  
Italy.  
the bui  
and at  
year 12  
in whic  
VOL.



Every visitor to Assisi will agree with Dr. Thode as to the ineffaceable impression which the first sight of the great church leaves upon the mind. The dark and solemn Lower Church, with its heavy masonry and mighty buttresses, its round arches, low massive pillars, and narrow windows, seems to breathe an atmosphere of awe and gloom, and to set forth the pilgrim's journey through this valley of tears, brightened as it is by stray gleams from beyond. The Upper Church, on the contrary, is brilliant and spacious, full of light and colour. Its lofty proportions, tall pointed arches, and clustered shafts, its large windows and jewelled glass, break upon the traveller who ascends from the darkness of the Lower Church like some vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. The striking effect of this contrast has led many writers to attribute a symbolic intention to the founders; but in all probability the builders who reared the fabric above the exact spot where Francis lay buried were forced to adopt this plan of a twofold church owing to the abrupt fall of the ground. None the less, the admirable manner in which they adapted their structure to the difficulties of the site may well excite our wonder. Unfortunately the name of the first architect who, two years after the death of Francis, began the walls of the Lower Church is unknown to us. Dr. Thode dismisses the German, Master Jacobus, to whom Vasari ascribes the work, as a pure invention of that writer's brain, and certainly no mention of the foreign builder is to be found elsewhere. The accurate and careful Franciscan historian Petrus Rudolphus, whose description of the church, written in 1586, is printed by Dr. Thode in his Appendix, says expressly, 'I have been unable to discover the name of the builder.' On the other hand, Dr. Thode proves that Fra Filippo di Campello, whose name has been preserved as the architect of the Upper Church, was employed on the works before 1232, and considers it highly probable that the honour of the original design belongs to this Franciscan brother. Certain points of resemblance between the Lower Church of Assisi and the churches of S. Nazaro of Milan, of Chiaravalle and Vercelli, which were all built a few years earlier and all show the same blending of Romanesque and Gothic motives, lead our historian to the conclusion that Fra Filippo was of Lombard origin, or had at least studied architecture in Northern Italy. His name appears repeatedly in the scanty notices of the building which are preserved in the conventual archives, and at the time of the consecration of the two churches in the year 1253 a letter was addressed to him by Pope Innocent IV. in which he is styled 'Philippus de Campello Ordinis Minorum

Magister et Præpositus operis Eccl. S. F.' The building proceeded rapidly, aided as it was by the alms of the faithful in all lands. Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia, appears among the list of contributors to the fund in 1255, and in another entry the Christians of Morocco are recorded to have sent their offerings by the hands of two Genoese merchants. By 1239 the noble bell-tower must have been completed, for Rudolphus tells us that the bells were hung in that year, and gives the inscriptions of the two largest that were cast at a famous bell-foundry.

The Upper Church is purely Gothic in character, and consists of a choir and nave without side-chapels and with a single transept. It retains its original plan, and has probably received no addition since its consecration in 1253, unless the portal and richly-worked wheel window were finished a few years later. The Lower Church was enlarged towards the close of the thirteenth century, doubtless in order to afford accommodation to the ever-increasing concourse of pilgrims, side-chapels were built on either side of the nave, a new transept was added on the eastern side, and the fine Gothic portal was erected at the south entrance. The building of the convent meanwhile kept pace with that of the church, and six massive Romanesque arches, similar to those of the Lower Church, bear witness to the beginning of the work in the first half of the thirteenth century. During the next two hundred years it received considerable additions; an infirmary and cloisters were erected by the munificence of different benefactors, chief among whom was Pope Sixtus IV., himself a Franciscan and the builder of the refectory and of the fine double flight of open stone stairs which leads from the doors of the Lower Church to the piazza in front of the Upper Church. His gorgeous frontal, richly embroidered with gold and coloured flowers and fruits, among which the oak-leaf and acorns of the Della Rovere family figure conspicuously, still decks the high altar of the Lower Church on high festivals. His portrait also appears by the side of his contemporary the General of the Order, Sansone, another active builder and restorer, in the beautiful intarsiatura stalls worked by Domenico di San Severino during the last years of the sixteenth century. These exquisitely carved choir-stalls, in the best Renaissance style, were the last work of art executed for S. Francesco, and have been recently removed from their place in the Upper Church to the ancient refectory of the convent, now used by the Government as a college.

One valuable result of Dr. Thode's researches at Assisi appears in the minute description he is able to give us of the old stained glass still adorning the windows of both churches.

He  
of  
asse  
the  
the  
the  
Chu  
olde  
fille  
the  
in s  
Mar  
Sim  
glas  
town  
da F  
tury  
door  
curio  
on g  
obsc  
schol  
in a  
U  
archi  
be le  
adorn  
count  
four  
comm  
and v  
maste  
of the  
or the  
that t  
early  
was e  
the G  
years  
Franc  
the 'M  
Church  
the lif  
as the  
paint t

He points out that many of these precious fragments, instead of belonging to the fourteenth century, as has been hitherto asserted, are the work of thirteenth-century artists, and afford the same evidence of gradual development as the frescoes on the walls, with which they correspond for the most part. In the large windows of the choir and transepts of the Upper Church he recognizes the hand of Cimabue and possibly of yet older masters; the slender lancets of the nave were apparently filled with glass designed by Cimabue's pupils, while most of the windows in the chapel of the Lower Church are Giottesque in style and drawing. The finest of all is in the chapel of St. Martin, and was probably designed by the Siena master, Simone Martini, who painted the walls. The names of several glass-painters, chiefly natives of Assisi and the neighbouring towns, appear in the archives. Among them is that of Antonio da Pisa, one of the first glass-painters of the fourteenth century, whose fine window is still to be seen over the south door of the Duomo of Florence. Dr. Thode discovered a curious manuscript by this Antonio in the archives, a treatise on glass-painting, which was published sixty years ago by an obscure local writer, but has hitherto escaped the attention of scholars, and which before long he hopes to give to the world in a new form.

Unfortunately Dr. Thode's prolonged researches in the archives of Assisi have convinced him that nothing new is to be learnt there respecting the history of the frescoes which adorn the walls of both the churches. While the names of countless inferior workmen who were employed during the fourteenth century are given in the account-books of the community, those of Cimabue and Giotto do not occur once, and we have no record of the date when a single one of these masterpieces was painted, while we can tell the precise day of the month and year when the convent cells were plastered or the leading of roof and windows was repaired. We know that the task of decorating the Lower Church began at a very early period, in fact, before the building of the Upper Church was ended. In 1236 Giunta da Pisa painted a crucifix for the General of the Order, Brother Elias, and some twenty years later an unknown artist executed the portrait of St. Francis, preserved in the Sacristy. Between 1260 and 1270 the 'Master of Francis' adorned the walls of the Lower Church first with legends of the Saint, then with subjects from the life of Christ. Cimabue, Dr. Thode conjectures, began life as the scholar of this artist, and proceeded as he grew up to paint the frescoes of the choir and transept in the Upper Church.

The colour of these has almost entirely disappeared, little more than the outlines of the original design are left, but rude as they are in execution, there is an animation and earnestness about them, a certain grandeur and mystic meaning which becomes still further manifest in the upper row of frescoes of Old and New Testament subjects along the walls of the nave. These Dr. Thode considers to be the work not of Cimabue, as has generally been supposed, but of his scholars, among whom the hand of Giotto is, in his opinion, plainly visible. Below this series, on the lower part of the walls, are the twenty-eight scenes from the life of Francis, in which the young Florentine altogether casts away the bonds, and, upborne on the tide of the new revival, rises to heights as yet undreamt of in the history of art. Dr. Thode concludes that, after serving his apprenticeship here, in the last decade of the century, Giotto went on, in 1298, to work in Rome, Padua, and Florence, and returned to Assisi several years later to paint the allegories in the choir of the Lower Church and the frescoes of the Childhood and Passion of Christ in the north transept, if not also those in the chapels of St. Nicholas and St. Mary Magdalene, generally ascribed to his followers, but in Dr. Thode's opinion bearing strong marks of the great master's own hand. It is impossible to enter upon the vexed question of authorship in these pages, and the best critics are scarcely likely to agree upon works which have suffered so much injury. Two things, however, are clear. In the first place the great church of Francis was the cradle of early Florentine art, and here alone can we follow its gradual development from the first rude beginnings. Secondly, it is plain that Giotto had by far the largest share in the whole work of decoration. It is curious to notice how each succeeding critic who devotes himself to the task of studying the frescoes at Assisi assigns something more to Giotto. A few years ago the famous Allegories were the only works universally recognized as his creation. For long it was held doubtful whether Giotto had any share in the Life of Francis, much more that the whole series could be his work, and when that was admitted, many critics would not allow him to be the author of the Crucifixion and Childhood in the transept of the Lower Church. This statement, first made, we believe, by Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, is, we are glad to see, supported by the testimony of the sixteenth-century writer, Rudolphus, who affirms as a positive fact that these frescoes were painted by Giotto. And now Dr. Thode goes a step further and believes, or would like to believe, that Giotto, assisted by his followers,

painted several of the chapels of the Lower Church. Whether he is right or not in this particular, there can be no question as to the truth of his general assumption that Giotto's influence is the predominating spirit here, not only in the frescoes recognized as his production or in those which his followers executed after his designs, but also in the works which the best Sienese masters painted at Assisi in the course of the fourteenth century. Both Simone Martini's fine frescoes in the chapel of St. Martin and those of the Passion, by Pietro Lorenzetti, in the south transept show how much these artists learnt from their great Florentine predecessor. So we arrive at Dr. Thode's conclusion that Giotto is, above all others, the painter of Francis, the one man in whose art the enthusiastic devotion of the Saint found its fullest expression. Francis and Giotto are the two names which we remember gratefully in the dim spaces of the great double church—Francis, whose life and teaching showed the way; Giotto, whose steps were the first to tread the path which led towards the triumphant goal.

The fourth division of our author's work treats of Franciscan churches in Italy. The example which had been set by the immediate followers of St. Francis at Assisi was soon followed in other places, and new churches were built in all parts of Italy. That grand double church, consecrated as it was to the memory of the Saint himself, and built by the alms of the whole of Christendom, could not supply the type for ordinary churches of the order. But the Franciscan builders followed Filippo di Campello's example in adopting Gothic forms exclusively in their churches. He points out what is certainly a striking and curious fact, that all the three churches which Francis himself helped to restore with his own hands, S. Damiano, S. Pietro, and the little chapel of the Portiuncula, were all built in a style similar to the ecclesiastical architecture of this period in the south of France, and that the same style appears again in the oldest chapel of his favourite sanctuary on Mount Alvernia. Thus it would seem that Francis himself had a share in the introduction of Gothic architecture into his native land. However this may be, the study of Mendicant churches of this period is, in Dr. Thode's words, the study of Gothic architecture in Italy. The new Franciscan churches which sprang up during the next hundred years in every town and village throughout Umbria and Tuscany were built of brick and conformed strictly to the simplicity which Francis had enjoined. Following the pattern of Cistercian churches, they were for the most part without

aisles, and consisted of a long nave with a wooden roof, a single transept at the east end, and a chapel on either side of the choir. In the larger and more splendid churches the number of chapels varies considerably. Santa Croce of Florence, for instance, in which Franciscan architecture may be said to have reached its grandest development, has as many as ten. Certain modifications were gradually introduced, and in some cases the walls were encrusted with marble, but the original plan remained, as a rule, the same. The artistic merit of these brick-walled, wooden-roofed churches depended entirely on their beauty of line and harmony of proportion, and besides being truly Italian in character, they have an additional interest as supplying the type of the Renaissance churches of the fifteenth century. Alberti's S. Andrea at Mantua and his still more famous temple at Rimini; Sansovino's San Francesco della Vigna at Venice, Cronaca's San Francesco al Monte in Florence, which Michel Angelo called 'la bella villanella,' San Pietro Montorio in Rome, and Santa Chiara of Naples all preserve the leading features of these old Tuscan and Umbrian Franciscan churches. It was from Florence again that, as of old, the painters, so now the builders of the new style, went forth to raise churches on the classical pattern in the chief cities of Italy. A separate chapter is reserved for the Franciscan churches of North Italy, which were less simple in character, and were generally built with aisles, vaulted roofs, and polygonal apse, while in some cases, as at Bologna and Padua, we find an ambulatory and circle of chapels at the back of the choir. Chief among these is Santa Maria Gloriosa de' Frari, the great Franciscan church of Venice, founded in the year 1250. The new movement had already taken root here, and the noblest families of the Republic vied with each other in contributing to the building of this splendid monument of Venetian piety. Two other well-known churches, SS. Giovanni Paolo of Venice, and S. Anastasia of Verona, both of them belonging to the Dominicans, were evidently built on the pattern of S. Maria de' Frari, the Franciscans here, as in other places, taking the lead and showing their brother Mendicants the way.

The second part of Dr. Thode's volume contains a learned history of the Franciscan order and of the philosophers, preachers, and poets who sprang from its ranks. He tells us the history of its growth and of its decay; how, once the first ardour had died out, sloth and worldliness crept in; how reforms were attempted and new branches founded. But at the same time he shows how the Mendicant orders swept into their

ran  
age  
fol  
rep  
oth  
in  
lut  
Wi  
of  
pre  
bur  
goo  
Th  
ord  
wit  
anc  
hav  
pop  
feel  
of  
of

pop  
the  
aga  
seen  
the  
Mir  
the  
Em  
the  
poet  
port  
Prat  
Ital  
Add  
both  
fami  
suits  
well  
his  
noun  
city  
peop  
exal



ranks all the ablest thinkers and most aspiring souls of the age, and how the spirit of Francis descended upon many of his followers. On one side his mystic theology and poetry is represented in Bonaventura, the Seraphic Doctor; on the other his assertion of individual freedom finds development in the subtle philosophy of Duns Scotus and the more revolutionary speculations, both political and metaphysical, of William of Ockham. But perhaps the most interesting feature of this chapter is our author's account of the Franciscan preachers. Foremost among them is Berthold von Regensburg, whose preaching is considered by Gervinus and other good judges to have been superior to that of Tauler himself. This popular Franciscan preacher became a member of the order in 1246, and from 1250 until his death in 1272 preached with extraordinary success in Germany, Austria, Bohemia, and Switzerland. His sermons, which the zeal of his hearers have fortunately preserved to us, are good specimens of popular Franciscan oratory, and in simple eloquence, in poetic feeling and tone of natural imagery, and in the glowing ardour of his devotion, he seems to have closely resembled the Saint of Assisi.

Another means by which the Franciscans worked upon popular feeling and communicated their religious fervour to the masses was the use of sacred poetry. In this respect again they followed the example of Francis, who, as we have seen, was himself a poet. So too was the great doctor and theologian Bonaventura, and two other of the first Brothers Minor, Fra Pacifico, who was a troubadour before he joined the order, and had been crowned as 'rex versuum,' by the Emperor's own hand, and Thomas of Celano, the author of the *Dies Iræ*. But the most famous, and certainly the truest, poet of the Franciscan order was Jacopone da Todi, whose portrait Dr. Thode discovered in the sacristy of the cathedral of Prato. M. Ozanam, in his book *Les Poètes Franciscains en Italie au treizième siècle*, and, still more recently, Mr. John Addington Symonds, in his *History of the Renaissance*, have both told us the story of this strange being. He was of good family, and spent his youth in the enjoyment of secular pursuits. He studied law at Bologna, and married a fair and well-born lady, whose sudden death soon afterwards led to his conversion. Following the example of Francis, he renounced all his earthly goods, and journeying on foot from city to city, preached Christ with passionate fervour to the people. But his conduct was so eccentric, and his religious exaltation at times reached such a pitch of frenzy, that even

the Brothers Minor thought him mad, and hesitated before they would admit him to their order. He was finally received in 1278, and outdid all his brethren in the severity of his penances and rigid observance of the rule. In 1298 he was thrown into prison for writing satires against Pope Boniface VIII., whom he regarded as a worldling and a usurper, and composed some of his finest poems during his five years' imprisonment. On the death of that pontiff he was released, and spent his last years in the seclusion of the cloister, writing hymns and lauds to the last. It is said that in his latter years he wept constantly, and that when he was asked the cause of his tears, he replied, 'I weep because men love not the True Love.' But this poor friar, who ran about the streets in his rags, and was held by his contemporaries to be a fool and a madman, was a great lyric poet. His hymns give vent to all the mingled emotions of the devout soul. He paints the vanity of earthly things and the ravages of all-devouring death with ghastly colours, warns the great of this world of the coming Judge, and sings sweetly of the birth and life of Christ, or, soaring to still higher flights, describes all the rapture of the soul which loses itself in God. The *Stabat Mater* is his best known poem, but Dr. Thode names several others which are of almost equal beauty. These lyrics, we feel, come from the heart of the people, and are as true an expression of the age as Giotto's frescoes. The same dramatic element which we find in the great painter's masterpieces is present in many of Jacopone's poems, and while Ozanam sees in certain of his dialogues the first feeble essays of the national drama, Dr. Thode is inclined to ascribe the introduction of miracle plays into Italy to the Franciscans, and points to the legend of Francis and the Christmas manger at Greccio in illustration of his idea. While Jacopone was pouring out the love which his heart could not contain in passionate outbursts of song, Dr. Thode reminds us that a greater poet was writing his mighty dream of heaven and hell, a poet who yielded to none in his reverence for St. Francis, and in whose immortal verse the *glorioso poverell' di Dio* was to receive his sublimest meed of praise.

In another chapter our author goes on to prove that music, as well as painting, architecture, and poetry, received liberal encouragement from the Brothers Minor. Thomas of Celano dwells repeatedly on the love of Francis for music and song, and the chronicler of Parma, Salimbene, records the names of several friars who, in the thirteenth century, were distinguished professors of music, singers, and performers on the violin. We

he  
nig  
son  
wa  
arc  
ver  
and  
ex  
Jac  
the  
Pa  
in  
or  
ph  
of  
scr

lar  
mu  
infl  
spi  
pai  
of I  
me  
bur  
stif  
was  
hea  
Hir  
the  
the  
rev  
was  
sub  
Sai  
new  
Cro  
bel  
app  
the  
the  
the  
the  
Mag  
in th

hear of one Fra Vita of Lucca, who sang so divinely that nightingale and blackbird alike would pause to listen to his song. This wonderful singer had, like others of his race, a wandering turn of mind, and after singing before bishops and archbishops, cardinals, and the Pope himself, he left his convent to live for many years with the Archbishop of Ravenna, and finally died at Milan. This love of music certainly finds expression both in the hymns and pictures of the age, and if Jacopone and his imitators describe the angel-songs as one of the joys of Heaven, there is scarcely a representation of Paradise or of the Coronation or Assumption of the Virgin in which angels do not meet us playing musical instruments or dancing in flowery meadows. That music in its higher phases was cultivated with especial care in the great convent of Assisi is evident from the large store of musical manuscripts which Dr. Thode found there as yet unexplored.

Having thus shown how the revival of Francis had popularized religion by means of preaching, by poetry, and by music, Dr. Thode goes back to painting, and explains the influence exerted on old types by the new conception of spiritual truths embodied in his teaching. Not only had painters been supplied with fresh material in the legend of Francis, but the old Bible tales had won a new and intenser meaning. The men whose hearts glowed with new and burning love for Christ could not rest satisfied with the stiff and hard types of the old Greek art. To them Christ was no longer the unapproachable God dwelling in the highest heavens. He had stooped from His throne to take upon Him their flesh and dwell among men. He was their friend, their brother, Who had loved them, and given Himself for them. For the first time the full meaning of the Incarnation revealed itself in art, and the story of Christ's life and death was painted with all the beauty and tenderness of which the subject was capable. And so it was with Mary and the Saints. The Virgin Mother beamed with human love on her new-born Child. She was seen standing at the foot of the Cross, her heart pierced with anguish at the sight of her beloved Son; again, in the pictures of her coronation she appeared surrounded by angels and archangels, enthroned as the ideal of womanly loveliness—next to Our Lord Himself, the highest object of the Christian's love and reverence. Then the sorrowing disciples bent again in pitying tenderness over the dead Form, which they lifted down from the Cross; then Magdalene met her Lord once more with outstretched arms in the joy of the Resurrection-morning.

After mentioning certain subjects, such as the legend of the Holy Cross, and that of the Archangel Michael, both of which had a mystic connexion with the story of Francis, as favourite themes of Franciscan painters, Dr. Thode devotes his last chapter to the allegorical representations of Giotto and his followers at Assisi. The great allegories of the Franciscan virtues, Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience, which Giotto painted on the roof of the choir in the Lower Church, above the tomb of Francis, are exact reproductions of passages in the writings of Bonaventura and in the songs of Jacopone, while the Espousals of Francis and Holy Poverty, as pictured here by Giotto, were to be celebrated in a famous passage of Dante's *Paradiso*. The same connexion exists between the popular hymns of Jacopone on the Triumph of Death, and the other allegorical fresco by Giotto in which Francis is seen pointing to a crowned skeleton, in evident allusion to the vanity of earthly greatness. In these subjects the mystic side of Franciscan theology which had taken such deep root among the people is embodied in art, and allegory receives its glorification at the hands of the great Franciscan painter.

So, following Dr. Thode's guidance, we have considered the movement of Francis in its relations to architecture, to poetry, and to painting, and have seen some of the vast results which it produced in every department of human life. In this one passionately loving, passionately believing man, the deepest yearnings and noblest aspirations of a whole age find their best and truest expression. To stand on the heights which he had reached was not given to frail man, and it is not to be wondered if his followers soon fell away from the high ideal which Francis had held up before them. But they caught enough of his spirit to bear his message to the world, and the fire of enthusiasm which flew from their lips was not slow to reveal itself in word and form. And so the progress of the intellectual movement which we call the Renaissance is but the development and continuation of the revival of art and letters which began with Francis of Assisi.

---

18  
1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
Th  
sul  
the  
the  
op  
me  
dis  
dec  
our  
to  
inte  
Wh  
gio  
sign  
with  
led  
the  
wic  
trea  
the  
to C  
brou  
com  
in t  
vent  
we s  
instr  
of th  
thou  
can,  
toget

## ART. V.—FUTURE RETRIBUTION.

1. *Charge*, by HENRY EDWARD BICKERSTETH, D.D., sixty-second Bishop of Exeter. (Exeter, 1887.)
2. *Future Probation: a Symposium*. (London, 1886.)
3. *The Doctrine of Endless Punishment*. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., Professor of Theology, New York. (London, 1886.)
4. *Future Retribution*. By C. A. ROW, M.A. (London, 1887.)

THE books we have placed at the head of this paper are a sufficient testimony to the enduring interest which is taken in the subject. That interest seems never to flag; but rather the subject is approached again and again, and from the most opposite points of view. Yet the results are exceedingly meagre, and perhaps the best lesson we can learn from the discussion is one of humility. The purposes of God are not decipherable by us in all their fulness, and we must content ourselves with such faint beams of light as He has been pleased to shed down upon us.

The first book on our list is the Bishop of Exeter's very interesting treatise, which comes to us in the form of a Charge. What gives it an inexpressible charm is the vein of deep religious feeling which runs through the whole. It is a very significant fact that a mind of such a character, imbued also with the deepest reverence for the Holy Scriptures, should be led towards a milder view. The Bishop discards the view of the hardening of the wicked, and their necessary increase in wickedness; and perhaps the most interesting portions of his treatise are those in which he points out the relation in which the lost, as human beings, must necessarily stand to God and to Christ, and the probability that in some sense they will be brought to an acknowledgment of Christ. We earnestly commend the Charge to the study of those who are interested in the subject, although at the present moment we are prevented from following out the Bishop's points, which otherwise we should have been glad to do.

The Symposium on *Future Probation* is an interesting and instructive work, consisting of papers on this particular branch of the subject by representatives of almost every school of thought. Here we have met together the Roman, the Anglican, and representatives of the stricter and laxer Calvinism, together with non-Christian denominations and others who

might be said to be on the border-land of Christianity. It could not be but that such a series of papers must give some striking views and bring forward important considerations ; and yet the general result is disappointing. This, however, we regard as not so much the fault of the writers, but as due to the selection of the subject. In our view, the problem of Future Probation is so mixed up with and dependent on the conception we form of the Last Things generally that it cannot be treated separately in a satisfactory manner. One important result, however, of the work is that we are enabled to see the strivings of a number of minds, the lines on which their thoughts move, and their attitude to eschatology and religion generally.

Professor Shedd's work is powerfully written, and it is especially strong and striking in the view it gives of our Lord's teaching. It labours, however, under the disadvantage of being written on traditional Calvinistic lines. From this point of view we have a denial of the intermediate state, and the contention that Sheol in the Old Testament and Hades in the New meant to Jew and Apostle what the word Hell means to ourselves. The book, however, is ably written, and ought to be taken account of by all who wish to study the subject comprehensively.

Of Mr. Row's book we deeply regret that we are unable to speak except in condemnation. The faulty apologetic theory which the author propounded some time ago is now bearing fruit, and unhappily of a mischievous character. His treatment of the Old Testament Scriptures, his disparagement of the Athanasian Creed, and his shallow and erroneous estimate of the doctrine of the Fall are all tokens of the downward course on which the author unhappily has entered. It is this sceptical tendency which gives to the book an aimless character, and we should have been glad to have passed it over in silence, had we not felt it incumbent on us, in the interest of young and inexperienced students, to put in a word of warning.

We propose at the present time to consider some of the difficulties which beset the doctrine of the Last Things. These difficulties may be summed up under two heads : first, the want of universality, or, as some would prefer to call it, the failure, of Christianity ; and, second, the impotence of man to struggle against or overcome the evil conditions by which he is surrounded. They are difficulties which in themselves are formidable enough, and which must be severely felt under every form of Christian belief. The point, however, which we

wish  
and  
pop  
Thi  
mov  
over  
time  
the  
syst  
only  
the  
take  
who  
so lo  
ject  
belie  
men  
surm  
mian  
mov  
was  
Calv  
Chur  
issue  
men  
and  
and  
beca  
T  
part  
of th  
most  
situa  
It ma  
to th  
Chur  
Chur  
traliz  
pecul  
tion o  
fifty  
popul  
popul  
trary  
after



wish to bring out is, that they have been much aggravated, and in fact rendered well nigh insoluble, by that form of popular religion which we English people have inherited. This popular religion is the outcome of a vast theological movement which, beginning with St. Augustine, has spread over and affected the whole Western Church. From St. Augustine it passed to the schoolmen of the middle ages, especially the Thomists, and was by them worked up into a complete system. The general effect of this movement has been not only narrowing but even destructive. In its effort to mould the Christian system into a complete and logical whole it has taken the life and substance out of many doctrines, and has wholly destroyed others. It is, however, to be observed that, so long as the movement was inside the Church, it was subject to considerable restraint. The tradition of Christian belief and practice, the Creeds, the worship, and the sacraments of the Church offered to it a barrier which it could not surmount; and we see in the case of Wickliffe and the Bohemians how impatient minds imbued with the spirit of this movement already were at the restraint of these barriers. It was only when, in the case of the Reformers, Luther, and Calvin, the movement cut itself adrift from the historical Church, that its extreme character became evident. It then issued in a compact system from which many essential elements of the Christian revelation were completely excluded, and it presented Christianity in a form so narrowed down and one-sided that disastrous results and great difficulties became quite unavoidable.

These difficulties have in point of fact affected every department of Christian theology. It is, however, in the sphere of the Last Things that they manifest themselves with the most disastrous effect; and unhappily we in England are so situated that we feel their force in a most unmitigated form. It may be asked, How should this be, seeing we have opposed to the movement of which we speak the wider theology of the Church? The answer is, that no doubt the theology of the Church would to a great extent have counteracted and neutralized the effects of this movement, had it not been for the peculiar history of Anglicanism from the time of the Reformation downwards. It has so happened that till within the last fifty years High Church theology has hardly influenced the popular mind. That which has moulded and shaped the popular religion has been movement after movement of a contrary character, viz. first the great Puritan movement, and after it in successive waves the Wesleyan and the Evangelical.

The popular religion is thus formed on the lines of these movements, and in respect of the Last Things it feels, and feels keenly, the full force of the difficulties which such a narrow theology creates.

It may be asked, How are we to proceed under these circumstances? We notice that most of the writers who have entered into the discussion have taken as their point of departure Christianity as it is presented to us in the popular religion, and on this basis have tried to contend with the difficulties. The result has been, on the one hand, a pitiful helplessness, and, on the other, a dangerous tendency to give up or whittle away precious truths, which, however they may have been presented in a narrow or one-sided form, are still of the very essence of Christianity. Our own idea is that the only way out of our difficulties is to retrace our footsteps. We must go backwards far beyond the Reformation; we must try to get behind the whole of this narrowing movement; we must try to reproduce the Christian doctrines in all their breadth and fulness of life as they were in possession of the Primitive Church. How far such a wider view of Christian doctrine will affect the problem it were hard to say; for the difficulties, as we have indicated, are very formidable under any view. Nevertheless our object will be gained if we succeed in drawing attention to this mode of solution.

The salient points under which the popular view regarding the Last Things may be summed up are the following. First, may be named its doctrine of the Fall which issues in the doctrine of the entire impotence of man in spiritual things. Second, its rejection of the primitive doctrine of the intermediate state, thus making Heaven and Hell the immediate issues of the present life. Third, its reduction of the Day of Judgment to an empty pageant, devoid of all meaning; the saved being summoned from Heaven and the lost from Hell to go through the form of a trial, with the result that they are relegated again to the place whence they came. Fourth, its conception of the punishment of the lost, viz. unintermitted torture for ever and ever in the fire of Hell. We propose to discuss each of these points in succession.

The bearing of the doctrine of the Fall on the view we take of the Last Things is very apparent, and the consequence has been that this doctrine has not escaped the influence of that tendency we have noticed to whittle away truths which stand in the way. Of this tendency Mr. Row has made himself the representative; and it may be well before going further to vindicate the doctrine from the attacks which have been

directed  
the  
mon  
in th  
latic  
ther  
conc  
thir  
fall  
sacr  
only  
of H  
Him  
that  
of th  
Pete  
nor c  
refer  
St. I  
all t  
amin  
tive a

I  
beca  
not  
stude  
regar  
state  
temp  
God's  
life o  
expu  
natur  
state.  
Is it  
beari  
it, wh  
root  
natur  
into a  
ment  
of the  
of see  
rative  
No

directed against it. Mr. Row comes to the conclusion that the 'affirmation that Christianity is based on what is commonly called the doctrine of the Fall is destitute of all support in those Scriptures which constitute our only records of Revelation; it requires to be read into them before it can be found therein' (p. 149). The process by which he arrives at this conclusion is a very curious one. He finds 'that from the third chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Malachi the fall of man is not once mentioned or even referred to by the sacred writers' (p. 141). He finds 'that the fall of man is not only never affirmed by our Lord to have been the foundation of His divine mission, but it is not once directly referred to by Him in the whole course of His teaching' (p. 141). He finds that 'no reference to the Fall is to be found either in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in those of St. Peter, St. James, St. John, and St. Jude, in nine of St. Paul's, nor even in the Revelation' (p. 143). Lastly, he finds 'that the references to the third chapter of Genesis in the remainder of St. Paul's Epistles are four in number.' Having ascertained all these points, Mr. Row next sets himself the task of examining how much, or rather how little, the primitive narrative and the passages in question can be made to say.

It is not necessary to traverse the statements here made, because the whole method of inquiry is so faulty that it could not possibly lead to any result. How would a cautious student set about estimating the teaching of Scripture in regard to the Fall? He meets in the front of Scripture a statement of the primitive state of man in Paradise, of a temptation to which he was subjected, of his fall into sin, of God's judging him and pronouncing on him the sentence of a life of hardship and toil ending in death, of man's consequent expulsion from Paradise, and his being left to cope with nature on quite different conditions from those of his original state. The question is, What is the import of this narrative? Is it a mere primitive myth or fancy, without any practical bearing on the subsequent revelation development? Or is it, what it might very well be, a momentous fact, lying at the root of religion, and of man's relation both to God and nature, the thought of which and the effects of which enter into and condition the whole subsequent revelation development? In order to answer this question the whole structure of the Bible revelation needs to be examined with the view of seeing whether it is or is not related to the primitive narrative.

Now what does such an examination reveal? It reveals

the fact that the doctrine of the Fall lies at the root of the whole Old Testament revelation. It enters into and conditions the Jewish doctrine of man, and of his relation both to God and nature ; it lies at the root of the Jewish doctrine of sin, and its transmission ; it is a necessary presupposition of the Jewish doctrine of death, the Jewish doctrine of Sheol and of the possibility of deliverance from Sheol. Further, it conditions the Jewish doctrine of retribution—a doctrine, by the way, which nearly all the writers on this subject quite misunderstand. So also in regard to the idea of the Kingdom of God, it is the determining factor in all the stages through which the idea passes till it culminates in Christ. Lastly, in regard to religious observances, the doctrine of the Fall is implied in all the ceremonial of the law—its atonements, its sin-offerings, its purifications, and its consecrations. It is, in fact, not too much to say that if we remove from view the fundamental conception that man has through the entrance of sin incurred the penalty of death, and is consequently placed in a totally different relation both to God and to nature from that of his original creation, the whole Jewish system becomes unintelligible.

It is also further to be observed that the doctrine of the Fall in regard to its essential content is not a doctrine of revelation at all. It is a fact of human experience—a fact, too, which the unbelieving evolutionist is not only ready to grant, but even to emphasize. What Scripture does is merely to give the divine explanation of this fact. It indicates its origin, it measures its import, and it holds out to man the means of overcoming, so that he may ultimately be freed from the effects of the Fall, and be reconciled to His heavenly Father. How precious this divine explanation is, only those will appreciate who can in some measure forecast what man would have made of it had he been left to grapple with the fact himself.

A more important question, however, is the conception we are to form of the Fall. In order to understand aright the bearings of this question, we must go back to the Reformation. It was then that the representatives of the theological movement we have spoken of cut themselves adrift from the Church, and began to develop their views into a new system untrammelled by the tradition of Christian doctrine and practice. It will be found that the essence of this new system lay in an exaggerated doctrine of the Fall, which was then first formulated and put in opposition to the more moderate view of the Church. It was, in point of fact, their

teach  
ing  
exagg  
doctri  
the m

If  
throug  
differ  
is sub  
Fall a  
of ma  
and to  
and sp  
the ex  
the ex  
phatic  
nature.  
weaken  
being  
matter  
determ  
directio  
was mu  
strength  
He was  
taining  
tions w

It w  
Reform  
own. T  
as being  
taught t  
was com  
words, i  
took of  
the *Form*  
profound  
in man's  
vehement  
(instar c  
totius na  
doctrine  
free will.  
will to g  
bias in th  
VOL. X

teaching regarding the Fall which conditioned all the remaining doctrines of their system, and as it is precisely this exaggerated doctrine of the Fall which has compromised the doctrine of the Last Things, we need, if we would understand the matter aright, to look closely at its essential elements.

If we look first at the doctrine of the Church we find that throughout the whole Church, both East and West, under differences of statement, there is a doctrine of the Fall which is substantially the same. Both East and West conceive the Fall as a great calamity, breaking up the primitive relations of man to God, entailing upon man judgment and suffering, and to a lamentable extent injuring and weakening his moral and spiritual powers and capacities. In estimating, however, the extent of this injury, both Churches refuse to go beyond the expression that man's nature was *weakened*; both emphatically deny that the Fall touched the essence of human nature. Man issued from the calamity of the Fall hurt and weakened, it is true, but still substantially the same human being that he was before. More especially if we judge the matter in regard to free will—that is to say, man's freedom to determine himself in the direction of good as well as in the direction of evil—they hold that though the will to good was much weakened and the will to evil proportionately strengthened, yet in point of fact man retained his free will. He was still capable of feeling the burden of sin and entertaining desires and aspirations after good—desires and aspirations which, with Divine help, might be realized.

It was in opposition to this moderate doctrine that the Reformers, both Lutherans and Calvinists, propounded their own. They especially fixed upon the expression *weakened* as being totally inadequate to express the reality. They taught that man's nature so far from being merely weakened was completely and wholly depraved to its inmost core. No words, in fact, could exaggerate the extreme view that they took of this entire depravation. Original sin, according to the *Formula Concordiæ*, was a corruption of human nature so profound that it left 'nothing sound, nothing incorrupt, either in man's body or his soul.' And in words of almost passionate vehemence it speaks of it as '*Intima pessima profundissima (instar cujusdam abyssi) inscrutabilis et ineffabilis corruptio totius naturæ.*' The real significance, however, of the new doctrine is only seen when it is measured by the question of free will. From this point of view the Reformers held that the will to good was wholly destroyed, and that an overwhelming bias in the direction of evil was established. So completely

was man henceforth dominated by evil that it was true to say of him, *Non potest non peccare*.<sup>1</sup>

If we look at these conflicting views we see that they may be characterized in this way. In the view of the Church, the Fall is a calamitous but still an orderly event in the development of humanity. To speak humanly, it is an event which, though not intended, must still have been contemplated as a possibility when the Creator endowed man with the gift of free will. And when it happened it did not alter to man the significance of his present life, viewed as a time of probation or education. It still left to man the possibility, with the help of his Creator, of conquering in the battle of life. On the other hand, in the view of the Reformers, the Fall is not an orderly event: it is a catastrophe. It is something which completely mars and destroys the work and purpose of God in His creation of man. It is a convulsion, a revolution which leaves human nature a ruin and man himself utterly impotent. The consequence of this is that man's present life is deprived of all significance. It is impossible to speak of it as a time of probation, or even as in any sense a battle, for man is so conditioned that his life is a foregone conclusion, and can only end in one way.

Apart from this exaggerated view of the Fall the popular religion becomes unintelligible. There is, in fact, no religious impression so profound, no doctrine so deeply rooted in the popular mind, as this entire depravation, this entire impotence

<sup>1</sup> 'Verbo Domini docemur, quod corrupta natura ex se et suis viribus, in rebus spiritualibus et divinis, nihil boni, et ne minimum quidem, utpote nullas bonas cogitationes habeat. Neque id modo: sed insuper etiam asserunt quod natura corrupta ex se, et viribus suis, coram Deo *nihil aliud nisi peccare possit*.'—*Form. Concord.* The great German theologian Möhler (as quoted by Bishop Forbes, *On the XXXIX Articles*, i. 139) has remarked, on the subject of original sin, 'how the Anglican Church on every point endeavours to avoid a tone of exaggeration.' The wording of our Ninth Article justifies the encomium, and is worth recalling: 'Original sin is the fault and the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness'—not 'wholly deprived of' as the Assembly of Divines in 1643 preferred—'and is of his own nature inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit,' &c. And further on: 'Concupiscence and lust hath of itself *the nature of sin*.' Not, as the Assembly of Divines wished to put it, 'is truly and properly sin.' It hath 'the nature of sin,' because, as Bishop Forbes expounds the passage, 'it at least provokes to sin' (p. 150). He adds: 'If all the germs of good be extirpated in fallen man, there can be no co-operation on his part with the work of divine grace. . . . Though he be *laesus in naturalibus, destitutus in gratuitis*, there still exists the capacity for the love of God, there remains full scope for a supernatural transfiguration.'



of man. It is this which conditions every doctrinal view in the popular system. For instance, this system repudiates entirely the doctrine of sacramental grace. Why? No doubt a hundred reasons might be given; but the real one is, that it looks upon man as a being so depraved, so impotent for good, as to be incapable of such amelioration as the idea of sacramental grace presupposes. Again, it insists upon the Gospel scheme being narrowed down to a bare offer and acceptance of the Gospel message. Again why? Simply because man is so depraved, so impotent for good, that nothing else can be done for him. If he is to be saved at all, he must be plucked by means of the Gospel message as a 'brand from the burning.'

The bearing of these views on the doctrine of the Last Things is very evident; and surely it is most deplorable. It is self-evident that all who, from whatever cause, have not been able to accept the Gospel message must be numbered among the lost; for there is no other way of salvation. But what frightful consequences does this position involve? Nothing less than the eternal perdition of the great majority of mankind. For how few comparatively are those who do accept the message in that real way which is absolutely necessary! It is not too much to say that the vast majority, even in Christian countries do not. Take, for instance, those countries in which the Greek and Roman Churches prevail: in them the Gospel message, in what would be considered its vital point of view, is never even offered at all. Then in countries like our own, how often is the message marred by the imperfections of the preacher. Perhaps he is not himself a religious man; and if so, how weak and powerless will be his offer! It is clear that it is only in a few cases here and there that the message will have justice done to it. But then there are those vast multitudes, even in Christian countries, who live wholly outside the influences of religion. All this is painful, heart-rending; but the feeling becomes inexpressible and overpowering when we extend our view to heathen countries. There we have myriads of human beings born into the world, living, and dying, who have never even heard of the Gospel.

What is to become of all these vast multitudes? Let it be observed that they inherit a nature which has been ruined by sin. In sin they have been born, in sin they have grown up, and in sin they have died. They have not, according to the popular view, even one bright spot on which the eye of the Creator could rest, for all is corrupt, all is depraved, within them. 'Coram Deo nihil aliud nisi peccare possunt.'

How is it possible under these circumstances that they could be saved? But if they are not saved they must be lost, for there are only the two alternatives. Calvin, indeed, did not hesitate to say that they were lost, and he was even prepared to maintain that they were justly lost. According to his view they were passed over in the election; they were left to the fate which their race had incurred by the rebellion of the Fall. But the Christian sentiment of the present day has revolted against this cold-blooded dogma. Almost all the writers from the Reformers' point of view recoil from the terrible consequence; and others who are breaking loose from Christian restraint denounce it in vehement terms. It is pointed out that individuals now living are not responsible for the Fall; they are not responsible for the evil conditions in which they have been placed; it is not their fault that the Gospel message has never reached them. Why are they brought into being by the good Creator, and placed in conditions which can only end in perdition and utter misery?

It is not, however, necessary to pursue this subject further. We would merely indicate the result in view of the two great difficulties of the present day, viz. the want of universality of Christianity, and the impotence of man to struggle against and overcome evil conditions. In regard to the first difficulty, it is impossible from the Reformers' point of view to vindicate Christianity from the charge of failure. As a remedy for sin, as an escape from damnation, it ought to be universal—it ought to reach 'every creature;' but it has not done so. So far from having done so, it has only reached a few. Then in regard to the other difficulty, the impotence of man: so far from attempting to obviate it, it is by the Reformers and their successors accepted in the fullest sense, and even emphasized. Not only the outcasts of our towns are impotent to overcome their evil surroundings, but every human being is equally impotent: Under these circumstances it is clear how difficult it is to reconcile the loss of so many souls with the justice and goodness of our heavenly Father. We need not, however, speak of that. What we desire to draw attention to is an alternative which is very perilous to Christianity. May not those who cannot find satisfaction for their doubts and questionings in one direction turn the argument against Christianity itself? Unhappily there are many and sad signs of a tendency this way.

Let us now proceed to inquire how far the more moderate view prevailing in the Church is capable of dealing with and obviating these difficulties.

1888  
that  
esse  
cap  
well  
cons  
stat  
view  
evil  
endi  
happ  
form  
stru  
spiri  
no q  
a for  
end  
T  
hanc  
of th  
rem  
mess  
tion  
stain  
cess  
have  
souls  
Chur  
to th  
see a  
beyo  
not c  
huma  
of th  
that  
God  
strive  
God's  
be th  
and w  
delive  
may  
L  
dealin  
we a

First, let it be observed, the Church's view of the Fall is, that human nature, though sadly weakened, yet remained essentially the same after as before. Man still retained the capability of determining himself in the direction of good as well as in that of evil. But this draws after it the important consequence that man's present life can still be viewed as a state of trial, discipline, or education. Life may still be viewed as a battlefield on which the powers of good and evil fight for victory; or, in another point of view, as a drama ending sometimes tragically, but with the possibility of a happy termination. This was not possible from the Reformers' point of view, with their doctrine of the entire destruction of man's will to good, his entire impotence in spiritual things. From this latter point of view there can be no question of trial, discipline, or education. A man's life is a foregone conclusion; it can only tend in one direction, and end in one way.

This of itself is an immense relief, and this relief is enhanced by the different conception which the Church forms of the Gospel remedy. In the view of the Church that remedy is much wider than a mere acceptance of the Gospel message. It is, stated broadly, nothing less than the restoration through Divine grace of man's nature enfeebled and stained with sin. It is a long, a painful, and a gradual process; and in trying to conceive and appreciate it, we must have regard not only to the discipline and training of those souls who have submitted to Christ, and are inside the Church. The great work of man's restoration is mainly due to the providence of God in dealing with human souls. We see at once how this stretches the work of Christianity far beyond the borders of the Church. For God's providence is not confined to souls within the Church; it is as wide as the human race. We have seen that every human life is, in view of the Church, a battlefield; and as Christians we believe that that battle is not fought out without the intervention of God and of good angels. We believe that the Spirit of God strives with every human soul, and we believe that with God's help the struggle may end in victory. It may indeed be that this victory is not explicit. It may be simply disgust and weariness with sin, and a desire, formed or unformed, of deliverance. Still the victory may be a very real one, and may lead on to greater things.

Let us see now how far these positions will help us in dealing with our difficulties. In regard to the first of these we are asked, If the Gospel is what it professes to be, the

remedy of the Fall, why has not Divine Providence devised means that it should be preached to every creature? To this we reply from the standpoint we have now gained. The objection so put does not take into account *the whole work* of man's restoration. It contemplates only the work of Divine grace perfecting souls within the Church. This, however, is only a small part of a far wider work, the preparation of souls outside the Church. Souls are being prepared and educated in the battle of life, it may be for future admission into the Church; and in any estimate we may form of the success or failure of Christianity, we must have regard to both these phases of the work. To this it might, indeed, be replied: 'This is only to evade the difficulty; it is to confess that Christianity is not universal, and consequently that it fails to be the remedy it professes to be. We tie you down,' it may be said, 'to your own maxim, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, and we do not allow that the work you have spoken of outside the Church is Christian work at all.'

The maxim *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* we hold to be not only true, but absolutely and simply so; so true, in fact, that those who are not now in the Church will have to get into it before the end. But it is not true from the Christian point of view to say *Extra ecclesiam nulla gratia*. Even the narrowest Church theologian must allow that the grace of God works outside the Church to subdue souls and bring them to the gates of the Church. What we desire to point out is, that the vast sphere of Divine Providence, wide as the human race, has the same end in view. Individuals and nations now outside the Church are being tried, proved, or educated; and this proof or education is a preliminary to their ultimate admission into the Church. The result will be, if victorious in the battle, that they will be brought to the gate of the Church. It may be said, 'You are not entitled to assume this.' But we would point out that we *are* entitled to assume it if Christianity is true; and it is upon this supposition that we are now arguing. We are considering whether Christianity, as conceived by the Church, is capable of covering and explaining all the facts.

No doubt the want of universality is a great difficulty. When we think of the vast multitudes who live and die outside the Church, a deep feeling of oppression comes over us. But may not this arise from looking at the matter exclusively from our own point of view? No doubt from the human point of view this dread fact implies neglect and indifference on the part of Christians, and we can only confess our fault,

and  
Chri  
God  
in th  
this  
limi  
high  
for e  
to a  
to th  
unde

I  
put  
cast  
souls  
chan  
mora  
Chri  
impo  
argu  
to u  
matt  
form  
its w  
life t  
the  
doub  
much  
of an  
of un  
tends  
our c  
hum  
being  
plan  
these  
merc  
even  
born  
unfav  
societ  
the fo  
soul  
The  
unde

and brace ourselves to more worthy struggles in the cause of Christ. But if the matter is viewed from the standpoint of God, might it not be that individuals and nations are not now in the Church simply because they are not now prepared for this higher life and discipline? They are fighting now a preliminary battle—a battle which, if won, may lead them on to higher things. At all events we are entitled to assume that for every human soul life is a battle, and, as Christians, further to assume that that battle, if won, will bring the combatant to the gate of the Church; and this is as far as discussion under the present head will carry us.

Let us look now at the second difficulty: and we desire to put it as strongly as possible. Let us fix our eyes on the outcast population of our large towns. It is urged that such souls are so situated that they have not the shadow of a chance. The inheritance of a corrupt nature, the pestilential moral atmosphere they are compelled to breathe, the lack of Christian instruction and Christian example, make it simply impossible for them to will in the direction of good. The arguments, no doubt, are plausible; but it has always seemed to us that they have little weight. They contemplate the matter from an entirely wrong point of view. If we would form a true judgment on the individual soul, its chances or its want of chances, *its whole history* from its entrance into life to its exit ought to lie bare before us as it lies bare before the mind of God; and in this point of view we seriously doubt whether these abstract arguments could count for much. Besides we might reasonably ask, how far is this line of argument to be carried? When we consider the question of unfavourable conditions we immediately see that it extends far beyond the particular case in view. It is not only our outcast population that is unfavourably situated; every human soul born into the world is more or less so. And this being the case, we cannot doubt but that it is part of God's plan that it should be so. The battle of life turns upon these conditions, and it may be that they are exactly and mercifully dealt out to each individual soul. Nay, we might even go further, and it might be a question whether a man born to be a companion of thieves and vagabonds is more unfavourably situated than one born into the higher ranks of society. We must bear in mind that the gross sins with which the former has to contend do not sit so close upon the human soul as the refined sins with which the latter has to do battle. The fate of Dives shows what hard discipline has to be undergone before 'worldliness' can be burnt out of us.

We pass on to the consideration of the next point, the denial of the intermediate state.

The doctrine of Sheol or Hades passed from the Jewish into the Christian Church. We see this clearly, not only from the parable of Dives and Lazarus, where a picture of it is given under the name of Hades, but from other incidental mentions of it in the New Testament. On other grounds, too, the doctrine of an intermediate state, by whatever name it might be called, was a necessity. It was the clear teaching of the New Testament that the final consummation will not take place till the second coming; consequently there must be an intermediate state where the souls of the departed await that coming. The whole primitive Church believed in the intermediate state, and the Eastern Church has retained that faith unaltered down to the present time. In the West, however, it has been different. There, we meet with disturbing influences which tended to obscure the original faith, and eventually to substitute for it the doctrine of Purgatory. St. Peter, in his second Epistle, mentions the burning of the world at the coming of Christ, and St. Paul speaks of a fire which shall try every man's work; and from a very early period these texts formed the subject of discussion in the Church. It was out of this discussion that there gradually grew up the idea of the 'ignis sapiens,' which from another point of view was also the 'ignis purgatorius.' Down to the time of St. Augustine the idea of this 'fire' had not been further defined: the most common view being to identify it with the conflagration of the world at the Day of Judgment. St. Gregory the Great seems to have been the first who placed the purgatorial fire in Hades; and from his time onwards the idea of Purgatory became established in the West, supplanting entirely the earlier doctrine of the intermediate state.

This substitution made a far greater revolution than we might at first sight imagine. According to the primitive view both Heaven and Hell are unattainable till after the Day of Judgment. St. Justin Martyr even accuses of heresy those who held that souls attained to Heaven before the coming of Christ. But with the completion of the doctrine of Purgatory this view was quite altered. It was now taught that perfected saints entered Heaven at the moment of death, and reprobate sinners entered Hell. The imperfect saints, those who needed to be purified, were the only souls who could in any sense be said to go to the intermediate state: and even in their case the period of detention was not limited by the coming of Christ, but ended after a longer or shorter period

as r  
Purg  
gethe

V  
have  
tory,  
prim  
far f  
out H  
imme

L  
the in  
it ma  
By re  
bilitie  
world  
plishe  
need  
of a v  
avera  
that l  
in mi  
Scrip  
the ru  
at the  
of the  
St. Pa  
ity of  
to thi  
faith,  
deep  
chara  
there.  
them,  
are th  
consig

Th  
ingly  
For if  
diate  
soul a  
No de  
view,  
and c  
grace



as might be necessary. Practically, therefore, the doctrine of Purgatory destroyed the idea of the intermediate state altogether.

What now was the procedure of the Reformers? It would have been well if, when smarting under the abuses of Purgatory, they had gone behind the doctrine and restored the primitive view of the intermediate state. This, however, was far from being the case. What they did was simply to cut out Purgatory altogether, and to make Heaven and Hell the immediate issues of the present life.

Let us first consider the difficulties which this rejection of the intermediate state has created. It is easy to see how difficult it makes it to defend Christianity from the charge of failure. By rejecting the intermediate state, with its immense possibilities, we necessarily limit the work of the Church to this world; and the Gospel must be judged by what it has accomplished in the past, or may accomplish in the future. We need not, however, dwell on this. There is another difficulty of a very serious kind which it has created. If we look at the average Christian who passes out of this life, can it be said that he is fit either for Heaven or for Hell? Let it be borne in mind that the standard of Heaven is laid down in Holy Scripture as nothing less than perfection. 'Be ye perfect' is the rule laid down by Christ; and He speaks of the righteous at the Great Day as shining forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. In like manner the standard laid down by St. Paul is perfect and blameless. But how far are the majority of Christians at the moment of death from having attained to this perfection! They may have repentance, they may have faith, they may have submission to Christ, they may have a deep devotion; but the habits of sin of many years, and the character which these habits have imprinted on them, are still there. If these habits and this character are to disqualify them, on the one hand, from immediate passage to Heaven, are they, on the other hand, to qualify them for immediate consignment to Hell?

This question the popular theology answers unhesitatingly in the affirmative. And indeed it has no alternative. For if we cut out from our view of the future the intermediate state, Heaven or Hell must be the lot of every human soul at the moment of death. The difficulty seems insuperable. No doubt it might be replied, from the Reformers' point of view, that all those who have accepted the Gospel message, and consequently are among the saved, are by a miracle of grace at once perfected, and so made fit for Heaven. But

such a miracle, in view of human freedom, is inconceivable ; and further, it stands in opposition to the whole analogy of God's dealing, which is to leave us, with Divine help, to conquer our deliverance. Besides, even if we admit its possibility, we lay ourselves open to a retort. It may be asked—Why is this miracle limited to those who accept the Gospel message? Why is it not extended to all mankind?

But, leaving these difficulties, let us now pass on to the question of the intermediate state. If we assume, with the primitive Church, that there is an intermediate state, the question arises, How are we to conceive of it? Is it to be conceived as a state of inactivity, or as a state of possible progress? On the one hand we have the Scripture statement 'they rest from their labours,' and the Church's prayer, 'Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine ;' and this idea of rest seems to be the predominant one in the Eastern Church. Yet, on the other hand, there are, if we look for them, many indications of the idea of progress, which certainly in itself is not inconsistent with the idea of rest. Even the Eastern Church is not without such, for she allows that it is possible for souls in the intermediate state to pass over from the fearful anticipation to the joyful one. And although she attributes this more to the prayers of those left behind and the mercy of God than to the individual himself, still such a change cannot be conceived except as a step in advance, and consequently, to that extent, as a testimony in favour of progress. If, indeed, we think the matter over calmly, we shall find that there are many testimonies, and much that may be said for the idea of progress. First, we may note that every indication we have of the condition of departed souls—as, for instance, in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and in the souls under the altar in the book of Revelation—exhibits them as in full possession of their mental powers. The inference from this, that they are capable of spiritual advance, is so strong, that the burden of proof would seem to lie on those who deny it. In addition to this, St. Peter seems to teach, and most of the early Fathers undoubtedly believed, that Christ, between His death and resurrection, preached to the departed. This, whatever else it implies, certainly involves the idea that those who were preached to were capable of profiting by the preaching—that is, in other words, that they were capable of spiritual progress. We may mention that many of the early Fathers—St. Clement, for instance, and Origen—clearly contemplate progress in the intermediate state. Origen, indeed, unhappily carried the idea so far that he went quite beyond the bounds

of r  
Never  
before  
quote  
whate  
imper  
In  
Irenæ  
who v  
that s  
Jerusa  
betwe  
fold, a  
are ma  
et disp  
stoloru  
Spirit  
Patren  
sums  
dinatio  
gradus  
tude.  
Apost  
It is tr  
millenn  
Apost  
We  
in the  
preach  
St. Pau  
work o  
says, 'I  
be blam  
in Phil.  
hath be  
of Jesus  
in expro  
Church  
pressed  
deep co  
reasona  
understa  
stand by  
may at

of revelation, and thus brought it somewhat into discredit. Nevertheless, for the main element of the idea, as we have before quoted the testimony of the Eastern, so we may also quote the testimony of the Western Church. It is clear that, whatever else Purgatory teaches, it implies that souls dying imperfect can be perfected in the intermediate state.

In this connexion there is a remarkable passage in St. Irenæus, in which he quotes as his authority the presbyters who were the disciples of the Apostles. After mentioning that some are in Heaven, some in Paradise, some in the New Jerusalem, and that there is a separation in place or sphere between such as bring forth fruit a hundred, sixty, thirty fold, according to the saying of Christ, 'In my Father's house are many mansions,' he goes on: 'Hanc esse ad ordinationem et dispositionem eorum qui salvantur, dicunt presbyteri Apostolorum discipuli, et per hujusmodi gradus proficere, et per Spiritum quidem ad Filium, per Filium autem ascendere ad Patrem.'<sup>1</sup> Bishop Bull, in his sermon on *The Future State*, sums up the passage in this way: 'that it is the divine ordination and disposition that those who are saved should *per gradus proficere*, "proceed by degrees," to their perfect beatitude.' If this really is—and it very well might be—an echo of Apostolic teaching, it is not without a bearing on the subject. It is true that St. Irenæus applies it to his own view of the millennium; yet, if the principle *per gradus proficere* is really Apostolic, we might apply it to the intermediate state.

We think, too, that there are indications of the same view in the Scriptures. Not to speak of St. Peter's mention of preaching to the dead (1 Ep. iii. 19), there are two passages in St. Paul's Epistles which seem to point to a continuance of the work of grace in the state beyond the veil. In 1 Cor. i. 8 he says, 'Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.' And again in Phil. i. 6, 'Being confident of this very thing, that He who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.' The fact that there are two passages varying in expression, but the same in substance, addressed to different Churches at different times, shows that the thought here expressed is not a fugitive one, but rather that it expresses a deep conviction or revelation in the Apostle's mind. It is reasonable to interpret the one passage by the other, and to understand by the 'end' in the first the same that we understand by 'the day of Jesus Christ' in the second. If so, we may at least infer thus much, that in the view of St. Paul 'the

<sup>1</sup> S. Irenæus, lib. v. 36.

good work,' the work of Divine grace restoring men, will not stop short at death, but will go on till the day of Jesus Christ, when it will be complete. Nor is it possible to obviate this inference by saying St. Paul expected the Second Advent before the death of those to whom he wrote, and therefore contemplated the work of grace as confined to this life. For it is by no means proved that St. Paul had such an expectation; nor could those who believe that he spoke through the Spirit readily admit such an error on his part. Besides, St. Paul, as a matter of fact, had the same experience as we have. At the time he was writing Christians were day by day departing out of this life; and surely if he had had in view the termination of the work of grace at death, he would have expressed it so. But what he actually does is to assign as the point of termination, not the day of death, but the 'day of Jesus Christ.'

There is, however, another Scripture which may be used in this connexion, and which gives us a further idea of the intermediate state, solemn indeed, but yet salutary: the idea, namely, that this progress is accomplished, in certain cases at least, by the discipline of suffering. We allude to our Lord's parable of Dives and Lazarus. That we have here a picture of the intermediate state is unquestionable; for, not to mention that Dives is said to be, not in Gehenna, but in Hades, if by Heaven we understand the completed kingdom of Christ, and by Hell the place prepared for the lost after the Day of Judgment, neither Heaven nor Hell were yet in existence. And besides, Abraham's bosom could as little be identified with Heaven as the place and the mental or spiritual condition of Dives with Hell. Whether the fire is literal fire, or only a vivid expression of the great spiritual truth that we are made perfect through suffering, we need not inquire. It may, however, be objected that the general lesson of the parable is antagonistic to the idea of progress, and that it teaches rather that a man's doom is irrevocably fixed by the results of this life, inasmuch as it speaks of the great gulf that cannot be passed. It has always seemed to us that this view is quite untenable. Let it be observed that what Dives prayed for was not that Lazarus should quit Abraham's bosom, and take up his abode with him permanently in the lower sphere. He asked that he might visit him simply for a moment on an errand of mercy. And he is told that such intercourse between the different spheres is not permissible, and could not take place by reason of the great gulf. The words cannot reasonably be strained beyond this. They do not say that

after  
migh  
L  
exten  
name  
does  
state,  
may l  
Does  
work  
have  
from  
we ha  
intern  
the m  
the ve  
to thi  
certain  
from  
withou  
comm  
withou  
memb  
mome  
veil it  
under  
Churc  
differ  
are in  
concei  
not rat  
can w  
point  
Judgm  
judge  
represe  
Son of  
out of  
iniquity  
place in  
of Jud  
ment th  
Christ's  
plates  
dom w

after a time Dives, if he profited by his severe discipline, might not be passed on to a higher sphere.

Let us, then, accept the idea of progress at least to the extent in which it appears to be sanctioned by St. Paul: namely, that the 'good work' begun in our souls in this life does not stop short at death, but goes on in the intermediate state, till it finds its completion at the Day of Judgment. It may be asked, What does the acceptance of this idea involve? Does it not involve the idea of a Church fully organized and at work behind the veil? Certainly, if we think of it, we shall have great difficulty in conceiving spiritual advance apart from the work of the Church. And yet, with the tradition we have received, the idea of Church work going on in the intermediate state is sufficiently startling. Yet let us look at the matter calmly. We know that there is a Church behind the veil, for it is spoken of as a Church. How is it possible to think of it as a Church without applying to the term certain elements which St. Paul has shown are inseparable from the idea of a Church? Can we conceive of a Church without organization? Can we conceive of it without a common life and a common worship? Can we conceive of it without mutual help, without the active participation of each member in the edification of the whole in love? But the moment we attach these elements to the Church behind the veil it is seen to be a working Church—working, it may be, under very different conditions, but still working as the Church on earth works. Or to look at the matter from a different point of view: the souls in the intermediate state are in full possession of their faculties: is it possible, is it conceivable, that they could exist in an isolated manner, and not rather associated in society? But what other association can we conceive but that of Christ's Kingdom? On this point, too, it is relevant to quote what is said of the Day of Judgment. We confess in the Creed that Christ will come to judge the quick *and the dead*. But this judgment Christ represents as a purification of His Church or kingdom. 'The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity.' It is certain that the final separation will not take place in the intermediate state: will not take place till the Day of Judgment; and it is also certain that at the Day of Judgment the Church on earth will constitute but a very small part of Christ's kingdom. We see, therefore, that Christ here contemplates the souls in the intermediate state as a Church or kingdom which will at the Day of Judgment be finally purified.

And, after all, is there not a great work for the Church behind the veil? And is it not just our losing sight of this work which has caused all our difficulties? If we try to conceive of it, we may imagine first of all, what St. Paul seems to contemplate, the continuance to perfection of the work of grace begun in those souls who have submitted to Christ during this life. We might think of it as being, in its first stages, what it is now, the work of the Spirit bringing souls to the Son. This work might go on through many spheres, *per gradus proficere*. Then, when the bringing to the Son was complete, a further progress might be entered on in preparation for the final presentation to the Father. But besides the souls who have submitted to Christ in this life, there are the vast multitudes who have not so submitted. And yet their life has been a battle, it may be a victory. For we believe that every human life is allotted and arranged in the providence of God, and that its issues worked out, not without Divine help, are momentous. It may be that the issue of such lives has been to bring multitudes to the very gate of the Church; and if so, might it not be the work of the Church to admit them within her fold, and lead them on to higher good? It is true that our popular tradition that Heaven and Hell are the *immediate* issues of the present life, almost disqualifies us from entertaining the idea that it might be so; and yet if we believe, as St. Peter seems to teach, that Christ preached to the departed, the whole principle is granted. He may have communicated the benefits of the Gospel to those who had not received them during the present life.

There might thus be a vast work for the Church behind the veil—a work in comparison with which the present work in this world is but a faint beginning. And is it not this work that St. Paul has in view when he speaks of all things being subdued to Christ? His words, speaking of a glorious reign of Christ up to his Second Advent, are too wide to permit us to suppose his view to be limited to the work of the Church in this world. He must contemplate the work of the Church behind the veil. And what he indicates is a final triumph, a complete success. 'All things shall be subdued unto Him.' 'All enemies shall be put under His feet.' We may suppose that in this subduing is included, first, the gathering into His kingdom of every soul that can be drawn to Him by faith and love; and, secondly, the perfect subjection of all who harden their hearts against Him. It is from this standpoint alone that we can successfully deal with the objection as to the failure of Christianity. If we judge of Christianity by

what  
will  
the v  
it is

I  
obje  
Prob  
have  
end  
Judg  
in fa  
Prob  
secon  
their  
view  
For i  
seem  
which  
Wha  
with  
that  
and t  
but in  
that i  
that t  
way  
etern

N  
ties o  
the co  
on Fu  
lasting  
in its  
offenc  
But le  
cut' to  
we sha  
steps  
us out  
be bur  
or fall  
far sho  
that, a  
mind

We



what it has accomplished or may accomplish in this world, it will be very difficult to return an answer. We must wait till the work of Christ is complete ; and then it will be seen that it is a perfect success.

Before passing from this head we may notice a possible objection. It may be said, Is not this the doctrine of Future Probation, and is it not a dangerous doctrine ? The view we have put forward is that our probation or training does not end at the moment of death, but goes on up to the Day of Judgment ; and of course to this extent we may be said to be in favour of Future Probation. But the doctrine of Future Probation, as generally stated, appears to mean the offer of a second chance to those who, from whatever cause, have lost their first chance. In this sense it differs essentially from the view we have taken up ; and we think is not without danger. For it seems to evacuate the present life of all meaning ; it seems to look upon a man's life in this world as a useless thing which might be cast away in order that he may begin afresh. What we have insisted on is the continuity of our present life with that which is to come. We have emphasized the fact that the present life is the first stage in a long series of others ; and that this is the case, not only in the lives of Christians, but in the lives of all men. It is the 'good work' begun here that is to be perfected. From this point of view it would appear that the issues of this life are indeed momentous, and that the way we use it, or misuse it, will influence our fate for all eternity.

Nor do we think that the opening up of the vast possibilities of the intermediate state is attended with danger ; rather the contrary. Dr. Littledale, in his paper in the 'Symposium on Future Probation,' has pointed out that the threat of everlasting burning is so great that by its very excess it fails in its effect ; just as the exaggerated punishments for small offences in the last century had no really deterrent effect. But let it be pointed out to men that there is really no 'short cut' to the kingdom of Heaven ; that if we go out of the way we shall have painfully and sorrowfully to retrace our footsteps ; that every sin we commit must, even if forgiven, find us out ; that evil habits which we so heedlessly contract must be burnt out in bitter suffering ; and, lastly, that if we loiter or fall altogether out of the race, we shall come in at the end far short of what we might have attained—convince men of that, and we imagine it will have far greater power over the mind than the threat of everlasting burning.

We pass on to the consideration of the last two points.

Nothing shows so clearly the defective character of the views we are combating, as the fact that their general result is to evacuate the Day of Judgment of all meaning. According to these views, the separation of the wicked from the just has already taken place. At the moment of death the doom has been pronounced, and its consequences carried out. The just have been taken into Heaven, and the wicked consigned to Hell. The Day of Judgment, therefore, can be no more than an empty ceremony! How contrary all this is to the representations of our Saviour is very apparent. In His striking teaching everything turns on the Great Day. Everything is now leading up to It, and when It arrives It will bring with It the final doom. It will also inaugurate a great change—a change so great as to be by us quite inconceivable. For Christ's kingdom will then be perfected, and will enter on the life which is eternal. What makes that life so inconceivable is just the fact that it is perfect life. All our ideas for the present are so bound up with imperfection, with striving and struggling, and with progress onwards, that we cannot even conceive what it is to have attained. All that we can say is that it is life, perfect life, and that it exceedeth all that we can think.

If we look at our Saviour's teaching we find first of all that in many parables He represents the Day of Judgment as the final purification of His kingdom. Up to that day good and bad have subsisted side by side; but when it at length comes, 'the Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity.' It is clear, therefore, that the Great Day will determine for each soul the awful question whether it is, or is not, fit for Christ's eternal kingdom. It is from this point of view that it is surrounded with the deepest awe. For up to the Day the award is unknown. There may indeed be in different hearts anticipations joyful or otherwise, but the result can only be made manifest by the Day itself.

But the Great Day is presented to us in another aspect. It will be the rendering to everyone according to his work. It is said, 'He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully.' And again, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' In the light of these texts the Day will declare, not so much whether we are to be in the kingdom or out of it, but what place we are to occupy. It is said, 'In My Father's house are many mansions;' and it is natural to conclude they are of higher and lower degree. Everyone will be

assign  
be th  
read  
So r  
well  
jaunt  
have  
And  
have,  
place

Be  
chiefly  
of the  
cussio  
cultu  
second

Th  
the D  
lasting  
it is a  
but th  
we ha  
is first  
there i  
soever  
the lab  
concep  
lake of  
they su

Ye  
to be  
conflic  
it is im  
called  
be cha  
the mo  
In ord  
must b  
thing w  
or reb  
only or  
this nat  
as when  
stripes.

Mar  
VOL.

assigned a place in proportion to his work. This seems to be the lesson taught in the parable of the talents, where we read of some that are set over ten cities, and some over five. So regarded, the Day indeed is full of awe; and it might well be a consideration for those who part with their faith so jauntily: what if they have to come back to the faith they have lost, it may be through much tribulation and sorrow? And what if they find in the end, that, even if saved, they have, as a consequence of their desertion, to take a lower place?

But the point about the Day of Judgment which has chiefly caused difficulty is the sentence and the punishment of the wicked; and this brings us to the last head of the discussion. There are two points which have caused this difficulty: first, the terrible punishment of the wicked; and, secondly, its irrevocable character.

The sentence on the wicked in our Lord's description of the Day of Judgment is, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.' And then it is added, 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.' In the book of Revelation we have a picture of the Lake of Fire into which the Devil is first cast with the beast and the false prophet. After that there is a description of the judgment, and it is said, 'Who-soever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.' Out of these passages has grown the popular conception of the punishment of Hell, which is that of a vast lake of fire in which the wicked are immersed, and in which they suffer torture uninterruptedly for ever and ever.

Yet when we begin to think of this conception, it is seen to be not only impossible, but to bring these passages into conflict with other Scriptures. First, in regard to the burning, it is impossible to conceive it as unintermitted. It is expressly called by our Saviour chastisement (*κόλασις*), but it would not be chastisement if it were unintermitted. We cannot imagine the most savage of masters beating his slave unceasingly. In order to be chastisement the punishment, whatever it is, must be something held over as a threat. It must be something which is to be inflicted provided there is disobedience or rebellion, but which will be stayed on submission. It is only on the supposition that the punishment of the fire is of this nature that we reconcile it with other descriptions of Hell, as where it is said they shall be beaten with many or few stripes.

Many of the Fathers have supposed that the fire of Hell  
VOL. XXVI.—NO. LII.

C C

is not to be taken literally, but is a figure whereby the anger of God or the torments of an evil conscience are denoted ; and this seems to be the prevailing view in the Eastern Church.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, however, it is to be remembered that the idea of fire extends far beyond the sphere of revelation. It is in truth a tradition which is almost universal in the human race ; and, this being the case, we might be inclined to suspect there is more in it than a mere figure. Probably it is not earthly fire, but some analogue of which fire is the nearest representative. We might imagine it some terrible punishment calculated to subdue the rebellious into obedience. To those who remember what human nature becomes when it is thoroughly depraved, it will be clear that a punishment such as that indicated would be really the most merciful. Nor is it necessary to suppose that all the lost would require this chastisement ; nor that any would be subjected to it longer than necessary.

For if we look again at our Lord's words, may not the expression 'eternal chastisement' denote just the principle or mode in which the lost are to be governed—namely, coercion or force, and this in contrast with the eternal life of the saved ? The saved are elevated into a state of perfection morally and spiritually ; they are tied together and governed by our Saviour's principle of self-sacrificing love. But such a state for the lost would be impossible. They must be governed, if they are to be governed at all, as the kingdoms of this world are governed, by coercive force. In this point of view the state of the lost would be, in principle, merely a continuation of the present imperfect state of things, and as such would contrast with the children of the kingdom who are elevated into an altogether supernatural and perfect state.

In this connexion it is relevant to remember our Lord's view as to the imperfect nature of the principle on which the kingdoms of the world are governed ; as well as His declaration that His kingdom was not to be of this world, and that His servants were not to fight for Him ; and how on all occasions He held up His own principle of self-sacrificing love, and that His own were to be *drawn* to Him. There is something in the very nature and inmost life of the Church that recoils from the application of coercive force. What a shock was it to St. Ambrose and his fellow-bishops when the first heretic was put to death !<sup>2</sup> And even those Churches

<sup>1</sup> St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xvi. 9 ; St. Greg. Nyssa, *Orat. Catech.* p. 40. For the view of the Eastern Church, see Hofmann, *Symbolik*, p. 188.

<sup>2</sup> Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv. 497.

who, to their own detriment, have used coercive force, have borne witness to this feeling or instinct by the form of handing over to the civil power. In the Church it is probably an instinct of her future destiny, as opposed to the condition of the lost.

And this brings us to the last difficulty—the irrevocable nature of the doom of the wicked. It is seen, however, that with more reasonable views of the condition of the lost the difficulty loses half its force. So far as we are given to see, the doom is irrevocable. They have lost the chance of being raised up to the perfect life. They have chosen natural or imperfect good; and what they have chosen, that they have got. It is probable that by this time they will have understood only too well what they have lost. And, if so, they have that *pœna damni*, that sense of loss which divines say is one of the most bitter ingredients in the pains of Hell. But may not this sense of loss admit of mitigation in proportion as it is borne with submissiveness, instead of rebellious insubordination and defiance? We know that in the Father's house are many mansions, and it may be so also in Hell. This, however, is a matter on which we must not attempt to be wise above that which is written. We know that God is Love, and knowing this let us accept the conclusion of Dr. Pusey,<sup>1</sup> 'It is wisest, surely, to leave all blindly in His hands, from Whose words Christians, as a body, have received the belief in Hell, ever since He came on earth to redeem us from it. "Just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of Saints." He can reconcile His own attributes, if we abide His time.'

<sup>1</sup> *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment*, p. 281.

## ART. VI.—CREIGHTON'S HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

*A History of the Papacy during the period of the Reformation.* By M. CREIGHTON, M.A., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, and Canon Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral; LL.D. of Glasgow and Harvard; D.C.L. of Durham; Fellow of the Società Romana di Storia Patria. Vols. III. and IV. 'The Italian Princes,' 1464-1518. (London, 1887.)

WE must cordially congratulate Professor Creighton on the completion of this second instalment of his undertaking. The period embraced in these volumes, we conceive, must have presented exceptional difficulties to the historian. It lacks the unity of a consecutive and well-defined policy. It possesses none of the interest which gathers round the performance of heroic action or the influence of lofty principle. It affords no opportunity for graphic delineation of striking scenes which fasten at once upon the imagination and the memory; such as are presented by the tragedies enacted at Constance and the struggles waged in Bohemia. By the author's own avowal 'the epoch traversed is one of the most ignoble, if not the most disastrous, in the history, not only of the Papacy, but of Europe.' It is, therefore, no mean triumph of literary skill that Professor Creighton's narrative is never dull nor wearisome. His style is rapid, picturesque, and pointed. He has an artistic sense of perspective, and knows exactly what is necessary to produce a vivid picture, without overlaying his pages or distracting his readers by excessive minuteness of detail. The author's claim to self-repression may seem in strange contrast with the fact that the close of his fourth volume only just reaches the revolt of Martin Luther. Yet so abundant are the materials at command, and so numerous are the points of contact between the papacy and the internal affairs—religious and political, sacred and profane—of every civilized country in Europe, that we must allow the claim to be well founded.

We are not quite so well satisfied that Mr. Creighton does not err on the side of leniency in his estimate of the Italian princes who filled the papal chair. It is one of the most difficult problems to determine how far human failings should be held excused and human crime palliated by the moral



standard of the age. It is unfair absolutely to disregard the influence of the environment upon the organism, yet, in the case of the Popes, it is impossible to forget their sacred office and their exceptional claims. Besides this, it should be remembered that, although profligacy was general, it was not universal, and there were noble examples (such as Savonarola) of high personal piety and of genuine Christian effort even in this age of iniquity. Yet possibly Mr. Creighton's error is on the right side. It is a distinct advantage that the history of the papacy should be written by an Anglican clergyman who cannot be charged with ultra-protestant bigotry. The calm, judicial narrative of facts explodes Macaulay's theory of the need of exaggeration, and produces such an impression as no sensational writer could have effected.

The conclusion of the papal schism and the triumph of the papacy over the conciliar movement made the inherent difficulties of the Pope's position more apparent than ever. The central idea of a Christian commonwealth under the presidency of the Pope had crumbled away, and the place of the papacy in the new political system, as well as its relation to the new learning, had yet to be determined. Could any restraint be placed upon the occupant of St. Peter's chair—which should modify his despotic absolutism and assure to the college of cardinals at least a share in the government of the Church? By what means could the Pope maintain his command over kings and people, after the rude shocks to which his authority had been exposed in the dissensions of European councils and the palpable weakness revealed by the schism? Could the primacy, supported by forged decretals and the dogmas maintained by apostolic edicts exist in the face of the learning and scepticism of the Renaissance? The time had gone by when the pretensions of the Roman pontiff would be allowed without keen and critical discussion, and the alleged prerogatives of the viceroy of the King of kings were canvassed with unlimited freedom, not seldom with unsparing scorn. Would the aspirations of powerful nationalities and the liberties of national churches and the domestic policy of distant peoples be any longer subject to the despotic caprice of the Italian prelate who occupied St. Peter's chair? These were questions which were imperiously pressing for solution at the commencement of the period embraced in these volumes.

An attempt to resolve the first of these questions did not meet with encouraging success. At the death of Pius II. the cardinals assembled in conclave drew up a series of

regulations which, in Mr. Creighton's caustic phrase, should impose constitutional restraints on an absolute monarch, and which each one swore to observe. The most important of these limited the number of cardinals to twenty-four, and defined their qualifications. None were to be admitted under the age of thirty-three, nor without the recommendation or approval of the College. Only one relative of the Pope was to be raised to this high dignity. To ensure the observance of these regulations the cardinals were to meet twice yearly, and to admonish the Pope, with the charity of sons towards a father, if he had disregarded them. On such conditions Paul II. was elected, and the cardinals were speedily undeceived. The new Pope was courtly enough for the first gentleman in Europe, singularly averse to cruelty, kindly and considerate even to personal opponents, but determined to be not a whit less absolute than his predecessors. In place of the articles agreed on he drew up another series, which he said were better; and, summoning the cardinals one by one, compelled them to sign them, under threat of excommunication in case of refusal. He would not even allow them to read the document, nor to have a copy of it. Only one of their number ventured to stand out. 'The College had hoped for a return to power; but the Pope burst its bonds as a lion breaks through a net.' With like resoluteness Paul II. bore down opposition to his administrative reforms. When Platina, a distinguished man of letters, remonstrated against the abolition of his office, and demanded that his case should be submitted to the courts of law, Paul looked at him with a scowl. 'Do you talk of bringing us before judges, as if you did not know that all law is seated in our breast? If you talk in that way, all shall be dismissed. I care not. I am Pope, and can at my good pleasure rescind or confirm the acts of others.'

Such pretensions had, of course, been familiar enough since the days of Hildebrand; but we confess ourselves unable to accept Mr. Creighton's excuses for Paul's deception of his colleagues and violation of his solemn pledges.

'We cannot blame' (he writes) 'the conduct of Paul II. in this matter. The attempt to bind the Pope was a legacy of the Schism, and rested upon the principles laid down by the conciliar movement. But it had appeared earlier than the Schism, and was distinctly forbidden by a Constitution of Innocent VI. in 1353. It was natural that the electors to the Papacy should try to secure their own interests; but such a proceeding was entirely contrary to the canonical conception of the plenitude of the papal power. The

me  
nat  
to f  
dim  
mai

ove  
we  
aga  
be  
yet  
titu  
mor  
imp  
Sup  
each  
the  
such  
secu  
assu  
vale  
min  
term  
restr  
unti  
We  
posit  
does  
hold  
word  
judg

1  
papa  
of th  
derm  
read  
subtl  
struc  
work  
worth  
and  
asser  
and t  
'  
eating

method adopted of signing a joint agreement was singularly unfortunate. To refuse to sign would have meant exclusion from office; to fulfil the agreement after election would have been an unlawful diminution of his authority, which the new Pope was bound to maintain and hand down intact' (iii. 6, 7).

Now without 'adopting an attitude of lofty superiority over one who played a prominent part in European affairs,' we feel bound, in the name of Christian morality, to protest against this style of special pleading. Let every allowance be made for the difficulty and temptation of Paul's position, yet difficulty and temptation are the very touchstone of rectitude. Nor is the man to be absolved from observance of moral law who, for the sake of personal ambition, deliberately impaled himself upon both horns of a political dilemma. Suppose the submission demanded by common consent from each cardinal were 'contrary to the canonical conception of the plenitude of the papal power,' yet the last man to allege such an argument should have been the candidate who had secured the papacy through his own submission—for him assuredly the maxim would hold good, *Fieri non debuit, factum valet*. For a second alternative would present itself to a high-minded, honourable despot. What should prevent his determining, even while he asserted his plenary authority, to restrain his own action within the terms of the agreement until he had won over the cardinals to cancel the bond? We make all allowance for the perplexity of an untenable position. We would not judge too harshly. But that blame does attach to Paul, despite all extenuating circumstances, we hold to be indisputable, unless we are (in Mr. Creighton's own words) 'to run the risk of lowering the standard of moral judgment.'

The religious aspect of the Renaissance threatened the papacy with more serious danger than the attempted revolt of the cardinals, and the peril was the greater because it undermined rather than openly assaulted the citadel. As we read Mr. Creighton's exact and striking diagnosis of the subtle force which the Renaissance gradually exerted, we are struck with its similarity to powerful agencies which are working with like issues at the present day. The page is worth quoting as a good example of the author's manner, and as suggestive to those who are deeply pondering the asserted antagonism between the traditions of the Church and the current of modern thought.

'There were, indeed, manifold signs that the new learning was eating out the heart of the religious sentiment of Italy, and that in

so insidious a way that it was hard to see when and how the voice of protest should be raised. The Renaissance did not set before its votaries a definite system of thought, nor did it oppose any of the doctrines of the Church. It was an attitude of mind rather than a scheme of life. It did not attack Christianity, but it turned men's minds away from Christianity. It did not contradict ecclesiastical dogma, but it passed it by with a shrug, as unworthy of the attention of a cultivated mind. The discovery of antiquity showed so much to be done in this world, that it was needless to think much of the next. The Humanists were content to pursue their studies, to steep themselves in classical ideas and to leave theology to those whose business it was. . . . Their studies did not lead them to action, but supplied a mental emancipation. Outward affairs might go as they pleased; the man of culture had a safe refuge within himself. He lived in a world of beauty which was his own possession, won by his own learning. For him there were no fetters, no restraints; he regarded himself as privileged, and his claim was generally allowed. . . . The danger of these tendencies must have been apparent to many minds, but it was not so obvious how the danger was to be met. A heresy might be condemned; an intellectual attitude could scarcely even be defined' (iii. 35).

To what extent the spirit of the new learning had imbued even so distinguished a scholar as Cardinal Bessarion, whose orthodoxy was above suspicion, may be gathered from the terms in which the cardinal condoled with the family of Gemistos upon their father's death. 'I hear that our common father and guide, laying aside all mortal garments, has removed to heaven and the unsullied land, to take his part in the mystic dance with the Olympian gods.' Yet although 'the new teaching had become an insidious solvent of any definiteness in religious belief,' the Italian princes, who ruled the church, felt no alarm at its increasing power. Some disregarded, others ostentatiously patronised its votaries, until the passionate outcry of the Monk of Wittenberg rudely disturbed the dilettantism of Leo X. in his refined discussion of the purely academic problem, 'Does man possess an immortal soul?'

The most obvious and the soundest policy for the restored papacy was to unite the Christian nations of Europe in a common crusade against the Turk. The moral influence of the supreme pontiff, which had been shattered by the Schism, would be manifest in the face of all Western civilization as the head of a vast religious effort, in which powerful monarchs and populous nations should combine under his fatherly direction to thrust back the hordes of the infidel. The danger was palpable and pressing. Already the armies

of the Sultan were at the gates of Hungary, and his galleys might soon threaten the coast of Italy. Unhappily the distracted condition of Europe forbade the success of any such design. 'Everywhere were struggles conducted for national aggrandizement. Religious principles were everywhere weak; morals were corrupt; spiritual agencies were feeble. Before a crusade was possible, years of conciliatory diplomacy and ecclesiastical reform would be necessary to heal the breaches of Europe and revive the religious basis of its life.' The steadfast pursuit of such an aim would demand long and patient waiting, the consistent prosecution of a continuous policy, a wide acquaintance with and a statesmanlike grasp of the posture of European complications, and stern repression of any selfish interests which might mar the eventful success of the lofty object in view. But it would be vain to expect the protracted persistence of a Cavour or a Bismarck from rulers whose term of office rarely exceeded a decade, and whose aims were liable to be reversed by their immediate successors. The Papal States were surrounded by a seething sea of intrigue, and 'the state of Italian thought and feeling left no room for sentiment, and paid no heed to the lofty claims of the papal office.' From the robber barons at the very gates of Rome, and the petty dukes of the Italian peninsula, to the more powerful usurpers who reigned in Milan, Florence, and Naples, every man's hand was ready to seize upon his neighbour's territory, or to take any advantage which violence or conspiracy could compass. In Sixtus IV. and his immediate successors 'this Italian spirit entirely triumphed, and the papacy boldly adopted the current aims and methods of the Italian powers which hemmed it in.' It would be difficult to exaggerate the injury done to the spiritual influence of the Church by the adoption of this secular policy. A few examples may serve to illustrate its terrible effects.

In order that he might have agents on whom he could implicitly rely, Sixtus IV., immediately upon his elevation to the Papacy, raised his two nephews, young men of no position and little capacity, to the rank of cardinals. On one of these, Piero Riario, aged twenty-five, he bestowed successively the bishoprics of Treviso, Sinigaglia, Mende, Spalato, and Florence, the abbacy of St. Ambrose at Milan, and the patriarchate of Constantinople, so that his income exceeded 60,000 gold ducats. Another nephew was made Prefect of Rome, and was married to an illegitimate daughter of Ferrante, King of Naples. The treasure of the Church was

lavished to secure the friendship of Ferrante with a magnificence that startled even the luxurious princes of Italy,

'when Leonora, another illegitimate daughter of Ferrante, passed through Rome on her way to Ferrara after her marriage with Duke Ercole d'Este. . . . On Whitsun Eve, June 5, 1473, she entered Rome, and was escorted by the two Cardinal nephews to Riario's palace, next the Church of SS. Apostoli, while the streets were thronged with the Cardinals' retinue. The piazza in front of the palace was covered in and turned into a vast theatre. The palace itself was adorned "as though St. Peter were descended from heaven to earth again." The walls were entirely hung with the richest stuffs and tapestries; the splendid hangings of Nicholas V., representing the works of the Creation, formed the curtains of the doors which led into the banquetting-hall. . . . Fourteen bedchambers were adorned with equal splendour, and in the most magnificent was an inscription, "Who would deny that this chamber is worthy of highest Jupiter? Who would deny that it is inferior to its prince?" Even the smallest articles of use were made of gold and silver.

'On Whit-Sunday the two Cardinals conducted the Duchess to St. Peter's, where the Pope celebrated mass and gave her his benediction. At mid-day a miracle play of Susanna and the Elders was performed by Florentine actors. Next day the splendour of the entertainment reached its height in a grand banquet. . . . The plate was constantly varied; the attendants were dressed in silk, and the seneschal four times changed his dress during the repast, appearing each time with richer collars of gold, and pearls, and precious stones. The tables groaned with an endless multitude of dishes, some so vast that they required four squires to bear the gold trays on which they were placed. There was a representation in viands of Atalanta's race, of Perseus, Andromeda, and the dragon. Peacocks were dressed with their feathers, and amongst them sat Orpheus with his lyre. The name of the Duchess's husband gave occasion for confectionaries shaped to represent the labours of Hercules. During the banquet was a concert and masques. The famous lovers of antiquity, Hercules and Deianira, Jason and Medea, Theseus and Phædra, danced in triumph; then centaurs entered and tried to carry off the ladies, and a mimic fight ensued. . . . A roast bear in his skin, with a stick in his mouth, was one of the most wonderful dishes in this repast, for which every country had been ransacked. Next day was given a representation of the miracle of Corpus Christi, the day following another of the life of John the Baptist. Finally Leonora departed from Rome with rich presents from the all-powerful nephew, "who seemed to be son, not brother, of the great Emperor Cæsar, and was honoured more than the real Pope" (iii. 64-6).

It sounds incredible that this profligate youngster, who flaunted his mistresses, as well as his extravagance, in the face of Europe, should have been armed with special powers as Papal legate, and should have discussed questions of deep

imp  
atm  
car  
it s  
car  
duc

of t  
rem  
othe  
Sfor  
coul  
of s  
den  
delic  
the  
alar  
Lor  
hast  
into

Sixt  
Flor  
betw  
Mor  
wan  
thor  
bene  
press  
a be  
chan  
story  
his l  
tiona  
was  
and  
by tv  
the a  
make  
acqu  
Sixt  
more  
by th  
Sixt  
when



importance with the most powerful rulers of Italy. And the atmosphere of romance which encircles so exceptional a career is heightened by the poetic retribution which followed it speedily in Riario's death, after only two years' tenure of his cardinalate, during which period he had squandered 200,000 ducats, and had incurred debts amounting to 60,000 more.

Yet, whatever might be thought of such a representative of the foremost patriarch of the Christian Church, it must be remembered that Riario's conduct was fully paralleled by other Italian princes, such as Alfonso of Naples and Galeazzo Sforza of Milan. He was a prince of a type which Italy could understand, and the Pope, who could bear the burden of such expenditure as that which Riario incurred, was evidently one of the powers to be taken into account in the delicate equilibrium of Italian politics. Weak neighbours of the Papal States, who had anything to lose, were filled with alarm, and sagacious rulers, like Ferrante of Naples and Lorenzo de' Medici at Florence, were apprehensive lest some hasty step of the headstrong pontiff should plunge all Italy into confusion and ruin.

They were not likely to be reassured by the part which Sixtus played in the abortive conspiracy of the Pazzi at Florence. Mr. Creighton graphically details the interviews between his Holiness and Girolamo Riario and the Baron Montesecco, the prime agents in the plot. The two latter wanted to secure beforehand the Pope's approbation and authority for the murder of the Medici. Sixtus desired the benefit, but evaded the responsibility, of the crime; and when pressed by his nephew, stormed at him wrathfully. 'You are a beast; I tell you I do not wish any man's death, only a change of government.' We must pass over the well-known story of the conspiracy. The double murder of Lorenzo and his brother Giuliano was contrived by an archbishop, intentionally attempted in the presence of a cardinal (it is true he was a mere boy of eighteen if that be deemed any palliation), and was put into execution in the Cathedral during high Mass by two priests—as Montesecco, though willing to undertake the assassination, refused to pollute the sacred building or 'to make Christ witness of a crime.' Once more we cannot acquiesce in Mr. Creighton's verdict upon the criminality of Sixtus in this transaction. We hardly know which is the more horrible—the frightful disregard of their sacred character by the actors in this tragedy or the solemn assertion of it by Sixtus as the pretext for smiting Florence with an interdict when the conspiracy had failed.

The recklessness with which Sixtus IV. threw himself into the turbulent stream of Italian intrigue and warfare constitutes a new departure in the policy of the Papacy. Hitherto some degree of religious restraint had marked, or some pretext of a sacred purpose had veiled, or some sense of high ecclesiastical responsibility had palliated even the most questionable actions of his predecessors, but Sixtus inaugurated the complete and naked secularization of his office. To compass his schemes for the territorial aggrandizement of his nephew, Count Girolamo Riario, he lavished all the resources of his temporal and spiritual authority with an utter disregard of decorum, faith, or honour. 'Indeed,' says Mr. Creighton, 'it is impossible not to feel that the low savagery and brutal resoluteness of Count Girolamo were echoes of the natural man of Sixtus IV. which had been in some measure tempered by early training and the habit of self-restraint' (iii. 103). His plans were almost uniformly unsuccessful. 'He failed to overthrow Lorenzo de' Medici at Florence; he failed to win anything from Ferrara or from Naples or from Venice;' yet he became a powerful factor in Italian policy through the sheer force of his terrible and determined energy. Every prince in the peninsula must have breathed more freely when the reign of the fiery pontiff was closed. 'Sixtus IV. made possible the cynicism of Macchiavelli; he lowered the moral tone of Europe, and prepared the way for still unworthier successors in the chair of St. Peter.'

We have no space to dwell upon the anarchy which ensued upon the death of Sixtus, and which reigned unchecked during the pontificate of his successor. The new Pope was remarkable for little save his lofty stature and his open acknowledgment of an illegitimate family of children. Weak, indolent, and craven-hearted, Innocent VIII. was the scorn or the tool of the abler members of the sacred college. As needy as he was incapable, the pontiff released those who were guilty of the vilest crimes if they would pay him a sufficient ransom. When Cardinal Borgia, the vice-chancellor, was asked why justice was not enforced, he replied, 'God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should pay and live.' Murder and incest stalked abroad unavenged, and the general impunity of wickedness was fitfully chequered by punishments of the most barbarous character. Offices sacred and secular were shamelessly sold, and even the cardinals squandered vast sums in gambling. The one redeeming feature of Innocent's reign was the alliance he contracted with Lorenzo de' Medici, whose sage counsel preserved Italy from many an

imm  
the  
sac  
so y

epis  
to r  
sign  
and  
ame  
hos  
and  
men  
larg  
of  
cap  
the  
the  
—th  
Hun  
with

lack  
Knig  
Mas  
over  
Ann  
the  
Ann  
prom  
disp  
Pop  
Inno  
stri  
deliv  
at th  
Othe  
Fran  
Ven  
Inno  
Pop  
woul  
light

of I  
Borg

imminent catastrophe. The price of Lorenzo's support was the nomination of his son Giovanni, a boy of fourteen, to the sacred college, but Innocent refused to publish the creation of so young a Cardinal until three years had elapsed.

The brief reign of Innocent was marked by a disgraceful episode in the history of Europe. Mahomet II. was preparing to renew the siege of Rhodes, when his death, in 1481, was the signal for a civil war between his two sons Bajazet and Djem, and the latter, on being defeated at Broussa, sought refuge among the knights of Rhodes. Under the guise of a courteous hospitality Djem soon discovered that he was really a prisoner, and his brother—the Sultan Bajazet—offered a yearly payment of 45,000 ducats for his maintenance and detention. So large an income 'awakened universal cupidity, and the Knights of St. John found it more prudent to remove their lucrative captive to the mainland for safe keeping. He was carried to the Commandery of Bourgneuf, in Poitou, where he was under the protection of the King of France.' A host of competitors—the Sultan of Egypt and the King of Spain, Matthias of Hungary and Ferrante of Naples amongst others—contended with the Pope for the custody of Djem :—

'The Pope, however, had means at his command which the others lacked. Djem could not be disposed of without the consent of the Knights of St. John, and Innocent VIII. promised their Grand Master a Cardinal's hat if Djem were handed over to himself. Moreover, France had need of the Pope's good offices. The marriage of Anne, heiress of Brittany, was a matter of the greatest moment to the French monarchy. A strong party in Brittany wished to give Anne in marriage to Alain d'Albret of Béarn, to whom she had been promised by her father. This marriage, however, required a Papal dispensation on the ground of consanguinity, and the price of the Pope's refusal to grant it was the surrender of Djem. Feeble as Innocent VIII. might be in other ways, he showed himself clever at striking a bargain, and would not pay till the goods were ready for delivery; D'Aubusson was not made Cardinal till Djem was nearly at the walls of Rome. Nor did this miserable huckstering end here. Others felt that they might follow in the steps of Pope and Kings. Franceschetto Cibò, before Djem's arrival, tried to curry favour with Venice by promising to deliver him over to the Republic as soon as Innocent VIII. were dead. Some of those who stood closest to the Pope went further, and offered Sultan Bajazet to poison Djem if he would pay a sufficient price. No incident displays in a more lurid light the cynical corruption of the time in every nation' (iii. 132).

The gradual declension of morality during the pontificate of Innocent prepared the way for the election of Cardinal Borgia to St. Peter's chair. The accustomed farce was duly

performed of making regulations to bind the new Pope, and the anxiety of the Sacred College for a genuine reform was manifested by the wholesale bribery which determined their choice in favour of the Spanish Cardinal. With the startling juxtaposition of the sacred and profane which so continually shocks the student of Church history at this era, the new Pope at one moment expressed the sense of his own weakness and his reliance on God's Holy Spirit, and in the next, when asked what name he would take, replied 'We desire the name of the invincible Alexander.' 'We are in the jaws of a rapacious wolf; if we do not flee he will devour us,' whispered the Cardinal de' Medici to his neighbour in the conclave.

The election of Alexander VI., however, gave universal satisfaction. So fearfully demoralized was the condition of the eternal city that it was estimated that 220 persons were assassinated in the streets during the thirty-two days which elapsed between the death of Innocent VIII. and the coronation of Alexander VI., and the Roman citizens eagerly welcomed a capable ruler. The other Italian powers were equally profuse and sincere in their compliments. They felt the need of a firm hand to guide the State through the political perplexities of the time. That the new Pope was notorious for his influence over women and for his disregard of his priestly vow, that he was the father of children to whom he was devotedly attached and whose worldly advancement he ostentatiously promoted, was considered of less importance than that he was likely to throw his influence on behalf of peace in the distracted condition of the peninsula. In the light of his subsequent reputation the report of the Ambassador of Ferrara sounds mournful enough:—

'He has promised to make many reforms in the Curia, to dismiss the secretaries and many tyrannical officials, to keep his sons far from Rome, and make worthy appointments. It is said that he will be a glorious pontiff and will have no need of guardians' (iii. 165).

Hardly a year had passed before these favourable anticipations were utterly belied.

We cannot follow the tangled thread of cajolery, violence, and intrigue with which Alexander and Cesare Borgia pursued their policy of territorial aggrandisement and became the terror of Italy. Despite the clearness and skilful construction of Mr. Creighton's narrative, the reader grows weary of the incessant plotting and counter-plotting of the Italian powers; of alternate alliance and hostility between the same states, prompted only by the interest of the moment; of

sole  
may  
serv  
less  
or t  
a ce  
the  
siste  
son  
whic  
Mac  
Cre

pear  
disse  
wish  
histo  
play  
ing  
alwa  
neve  
enga  
in th

tion  
cont  
Tha  
ener  
mos  
doim  
mor  
of th

merr  
disca  
like,  
their  
know  
I can  
I can  
chron  
porte  
in po  
stone  
Had  
other

solemn compacts concluded and proclaimed, only that they may be abandoned as soon as their temporary purpose is served ; of cold-blooded astuteness in combination with heartless ferocity, unrelieved by one spark of honour, principle, or truth. Amidst the dark scenes which the history portrays a certain gloomy grandeur, like that with which Milton invests the arch enemy of mankind, attaches to the unbending consistency in iniquity through which the Borgias, father and son alike, carried on their selfish and ruthless purposes, and which earned for Alexander VI. the warm commendation of Macchiavelli, with which (although he does not quote it) Mr. Creighton is of course familiar :—

'It is necessary,' says the author of the *Prince*, 'to disguise the appearance of craft and thoroughly to understand the art of feigning and dissembling, for men are generally so simple and weak that he who wishes to deceive easily finds dupes. One example taken from the history of our own times will be sufficient. Pope Alexander VI. played during his whole life a game of deception, and notwithstanding his faithless conduct was extremely well known, his artifices always proved successful. Oaths and protestations cost him nothing ; never did a prince so often break his word or pay less regard to his engagements. This was because he so well understood this chapter in the art of government.'—*The Prince* (c. xviii.).

Mr. Creighton discusses at considerable length the question whether Alexander VI. were really the monster that contemporary and subsequent historians have depicted. That the Pope's irregularities were such as to furnish his enemies with fearful weapons against him and to make the most odious calumnies credible he freely allows, and in so doing admits one serious count of the indictment. He is more successful, as we think, in his endeavours to refute some of the many accusations of poisoning laid to his charge.

'We are ready enough,' he writes, 'at the present day to make merry over the superstitions and the ignorance of bygone times. We discard their beliefs in miracles, omens, portents, astrology, and the like, and we ridicule their knowledge of science. Yet we cling to their belief in poison, and are ready to suppose that they possessed a knowledge of poisons far in advance of that which exists in our time. I can see no reason to believe in poisoning more than in witchcraft. I can conceive no justification for picking out of the pages of a chronicler a record of poisoning as true, and passing by a series of portents as obviously false. The men of the fifteenth century believed in poisons ; but they also believed in charms, amulets, and precious stones which would warn their wearer of the presence of poison. Had they any better ground for the belief in the one than in the other?' (iv. 263).

The cogency of this reasoning is greatly strengthened by examining the grounds upon which accusations of poisoning were accepted by contemporary writers. If a post-mortem examination revealed the presence of organic disease, or the atmospheric conditions produced rapid decomposition, poison was forthwith suspected, and suspicion easily hardened into conviction. Yet, when every deduction has been made which can be claimed on this score, a frightful record still remains confessedly irrefutable, which goes far to justify the popular estimate of the Borgia as types of unrestrained wickedness.

In his elaborate and interesting review of the characters of Alexander and his able and unscrupulous son, Mr. Creighton places the two men before us in striking contrast and vivid portraiture. The father garrulous, light-hearted, and agreeable; the son sombre, saturnine, and reserved—the one gaining the reputation of fathomless deceit by the unrestrained frankness with which he discussed the darkest secrets of diplomacy; the other creating dread and distrust by enshrouding his most ordinary actions in mystery and by the affectation of darkness and seclusion. Yet, as we ponder and compare their careers, the life of the father, in our judgment, is more repulsive than that of the son. There is something inexpressibly shocking in the union of such ghastly and ruthless barbarity as that with which the Orsini were exterminated, with the geniality and joyousness of a man who thoroughly enjoyed life and wished to make others enjoy it too.

If any member of the Sacred College was fitted by his experience to deliver Italy from the danger into which she was rapidly drifting it was Cardinal Rovere, who, after an interval of two months, succeeded Alexander VI., and took the name of Julius II. He had passed some years of exile in France, and knew the contempt with which the French regarded the Italians, either as friends or as foes. He was clear-sighted enough to understand that the only hope for the deliverance of Italy from the presence and oppression of foreign powers lay in the careful husbanding of her resources, in the mutual forbearance towards each other of her several states, and in the patriotic self-denial and patience of those who felt aggrieved for the sake of the national good. A quarrel with Venice for the sovereignty of the Romagna tested the temper of the new pontiff and revealed the mournful truth that he was ready 'to be the slave of everyone' (to use his own expression) rather than sit down patiently under a sense of wrong. A plan was accordingly formed for the

dism  
Spai  
the s  
ment  
other  
the c  
the f  
aban  
that  
Alex  
for w  
emula  
vertin  
was e

'T  
of pea  
determ  
Old c  
assum  
others  
wrong  
was li  
conver  
Veneti  
import  
recogn  
with V  
her; L  
his wor  
nothing  
as the p  
to guid  
plan, a  
nomina

The  
by the  
excomm  
stronger  
too con  
destitut  
cenaries  
defeat,  
to the s  
collapse  
tians st  
league.  
VOL.



dismemberment of Venice, and the joint aid of France and Spain was invited to carry it into execution. The failure of the signatories to the Treaty of Blois to fulfil their engagements did not prevent Julius from effecting his purpose by other means at a somewhat later date, and thus destroying the one Italian state which might have successfully resisted the foreigner. It may be fairly pleaded for Julius that he abandoned and reversed the nepotism of his predecessors, that he lent a dignity to the Papacy which was wanting to Alexander, and that he acted persistently, if unscrupulously, for what he believed to be the glory of the Church; but he emulated and surpassed the example of Sixtus IV. in perverting spiritual weapons to gain secular ends, and his policy was even more disastrous to the interests of Italy.

'The League of Cambrai was a great political crime. In a time of peace, without any provocation, the Powers of Europe deliberately determined to combine for the purpose of international robbery. Old claims were revived; an arbitrary principle of legitimacy was assumed. Venice was singled out as the aggressor who had defrauded others of their rights, and Europe nobly determined to redress the wrong; it was of no consequence to the allies that every one of them was liable to similar claims against themselves. Separate interests converged for the overthrow of Venice, and the partition of the Venetian territory was recognized as an undertaking of European importance. No feeling of honour stood in the way; no treaty was recognized as binding. Maximilian had made a three years' truce with Venice at the time when he was meditating an alliance against her; Louis XII. professed himself her friend; Julius II. had pledged his word not to disturb her in her possessions. All this went for nothing. Self-seeking, without any other end alleged, was recognized as the principle by which the newly-formed nations of Europe were to guide their course. The man who, above all others, devised this plan, and the man who urged it persistently on the rest, was the nominal head of European Christianity, Pope Julius II.' (iv. 100-1).

The efforts of the League of Cambrai were seconded by the thunder of the Pope's spiritual artillery, and a bull of excommunication was issued against Venice, couched in the strongest terms. The first successes of the league were only too complete, and the proud queen of the Adriatic, her nobles destitute of courage, her people of patriotism, and her mercenaries of discipline, had no other resource after a single defeat, than to submit to the hard terms of their enemy and to the spoliation of their territory. Never was the sudden collapse of a great power more complete. In vain the Venetians strove by abject submission to withdraw Julius from the league. The conditions on which his Holiness insisted were

declared by the Venetian envoy 'shameful and devilish,' and the Senate declared that they would negotiate with the Turk sooner than comply with them. But Julius II. soon began to be alarmed at the Frankenstein which he had called into existence, and, terrified at the growing influence of France, he drew up fresh conditions of absolution and reconciliation. The weaker side took refuge under the subterfuges which the diplomacy of the time sanctioned as legitimate. A secret protest declared that the act of the Doge in consenting to the requirements of the Pope was null and void, and reserved the right of appeal from their present submission to a better informed pontiff. 'It was a clumsy way of asserting that self-preservation is the first law of states; that treaties are the recognition of existing necessity; that no generation of statesmen can alienate for ever the fundamental rights of a community' (iv. 113).

Europe had been scandalised by the conduct of former pontiffs, but never before had the successor of St. Peter been so essentially and exclusively a warrior as was Julius II. Nowhere was he more entirely at home than when astride his charger or taking part in a military campaign. Fearless of danger, indifferent to fortune, ready to share the privations of the meanest soldier, undaunted by reverses, resolute in action, Julius was much more a soldier than either statesman or bishop. He had neither the foresight to plan nor the skill to carry out a comprehensive policy; and notwithstanding his great exertions to preserve the Church from the schism threatened by the Council of Pisa, Julius was so entirely out of his element in an ecclesiastical assembly, that at the opening of the Lateran Council he could scarce stammer out a few confused words. Men were indeed compelled to acknowledge that Julius did not pursue mean and selfish ends. It was for the glory and safety of the Church, not for the advancement of his own kindred, that he devoted all his energies to enlarge and strengthen the dominions of the papacy. Not only was he the founder of the Papal States, and the first Pope who firmly established the temporal power of the Roman pontiff; but a certain grandeur attaches to his fiery impetuosity, as well as to the lofty designs which he conceived, but lacked opportunity or patience to execute, and for which he imperiously compelled the services of Bramante, Raphael, and Michael Angelo. A less resolute man would have sunk under the difficulties from which Julius II. wrested his hard-earned successes; yet the spectacle of so incongruous a Vicar of the Prince of Peace could not fail painfully to impress

tho  
stra  
cras  
the  
Ray  
thou  
earth  
fire

pon  
curi  
emp  
thou  
Coll  
mad  
eigh  
the a  
train  
and  
'noth  
his ex  
him  
restor  
was v  
reigns  
his b  
'Let  
the fir

But  
Europ  
politic  
of the  
against  
alterna  
sorely  
the cu  
side':  
Henry  
fully ba  
Counci  
clusivel  
absorbe  
and du  
compet

thoughtful minds, and to draw forth stern, pointed remonstrance from the victims of his martial ambition. Amid the crash of contending armies, and the fall of besieged cities, and the horrors of outrage and slaughter wrought at the battle of Ravenna and at the sack of Prato, men's hearts sickened at the thought that such deeds were the work of Christ's Vicar upon earth, and that it was his hand which sent down to eternal fire numbers of souls for whom the blessed Saviour had died.

We have but scant space to notice so much of Leo X.'s pontificate as is treated in Mr. Creighton's volumes. The curious uncertainty attendant upon a papal election was exemplified in the choice of Cardinal Medici, whom no one had thought of, but whose selection was popular both in the Sacred College and amongst the citizens of Rome. He had been made a cardinal whilst still a boy, and he was only thirty-eight when he succeeded to the throne of St. Peter. He had the advantage of long experience in the curia, and of early training in statecraft under a sagacious father, whose geniality and love of magnificence he had inherited. If there were 'nothing known against the new Pope except his youth and his exceeding good nature, there was nothing to recommend him except the political importance he had gained by the restoration of his family to Florence.' But the Sacred College was weary of the turmoil and excitement of the last two reigns, and they gladly elected as Vicar one who had done his best, in troublous times, to be at peace with all men. 'Let us enjoy the papacy, since God has given it to us,' was the first utterance of the new Pope to his brother.

But these were not days in which any crowned head in Europe could abandon itself to undisturbed enjoyment. Fresh political alliances were continually projected, and the interests of the Church needed skilful diplomacy for their protection against the schemes of the great European powers. The alternate fortunes of the French at Novara and Marignano sorely perplexed Leo, who was fully determined to follow the custom of the popes, to be always on 'the winning side': whilst the impetuosity of Francis I. of France and Henry VIII. of England was likely to disturb the most carefully balanced combinations. Even the sessions of the Lateran Council and the extinction of the French schism were exclusively regarded in their bearing upon secular politics, which absorbed Leo's whole attention. But in the game of intrigue and duplicity the Pope was at least a match for any of his competitors. At the very moment when his Holiness was

playing off Francis I. against Maximilian—now assuring Francis that he had sent no legate to Maximilian, now claiming Maximilian's gratitude because he had despatched one without delay—when he was temporizing with Henry VIII. and Charles V., with the Swiss, with Venice, with all the world, his ambassador at the French court was instructed to say that 'any misunderstanding or suspicion was alien to the Pope's nature and will, which wished to give itself without reserve, and to meet with a like return.'

Yet amongst the throng of intriguers there was not one who was more duped than the arch dissembler himself. His cleverness and good fortune had been signally conspicuous. He was lord at once of Florence, of the Papal States, and of the whole Western Church. He had concerted with Francis I. the suppression of the inconvenient liberties of the Gallican Church, and had secured his share of the spoil. He had escaped the dangers of an opportune conspiracy, whose detection and punishment furnished an excuse for reducing wealthy opponents in the Sacred College to beggary, and for adding to the vast sums extorted from their terrors the price of the creation at one stroke of thirty-one new Cardinals. He had brought that formidable and questionable assembly—the Council of the Lateran—to a close, and by his tact and management had silenced any rising murmurs of discontent. It was evident that men were living in the best possible of worlds. Reform was quite unnecessary. There was peace among the Christian nations of Europe. The only thing wanting was more money to carry on the proposed crusade against the Turk, and to supply the elegant expenditure of the papacy. A well pushed sale of indulgences in the less enlightened regions beyond the Alps would soon replenish the exhausted Roman treasury. *Populus vult decipi et decipiatur*. Only over the plains of Germany a little cloud was rising, like a man's hand, that would presently darken the whole heavens, and burst in a storm that would shatter to pieces the importance of the Pope's secular power, and call himself to account as the head of the Christian Church.

In our rapid review of Mr. Creighton's fascinating volumes we have mainly concentrated our attention on those secular aims which furnish the key to the papal policy during the darkest epoch of its history. We have been obliged to pass by many tempting topics which the author embraces in his narrative, and which serve materially to lighten the record of so dismal a page in the annals of Christendom. The glorious episode of Savonarola, the literary circle gathered round

Lor  
ture  
the  
and  
dati  
affor  
Ren  
finer  
sava  
was  
pow  
was  
wort  
prod  
adm  
the c  
geni  
perv  
rivet  
attain

F  
been  
Papa  
turies  
Europ  
hither  
conso  
Engla  
tende  
action  
the L  
pontif  
result  
petty  
dream  
for the  
rated  
not mo  
Castill  
Roman  
cleavag  
the ma  
and th  
came  
were c

Lorenzo de' Medici, the relation of successive Popes to literature and art, the quarrels of Julius II. and Michael Angelo, the revival of philosophy, the gradual decadence of Venice, and the light incidentally cast upon the growth and consolidation of the great European monarchies, would each and all afford matter for interesting discussion. The period of the Renaissance presented startling contrasts of the highest refinement of luxury and art in combination with the most savage brutality and the deepest moral degradation. Never was the impotence of æsthetics, unaided by loftier motive power, to civilize and ennoble, made more palpable. Never was the sacred name of Christianity prostituted to more unworthy purposes. Never did the creative power of genius produce with greater prodigality works that have been the admiration of succeeding ages. It is not a little singular that the era which was most resplendent with the magnificent genius of Italy should also have been the season when the perverse and selfish policy of her statesmen should have riveted for generations the chains which prevented Italy from attaining to national independence.

For one permanent result of the policy which we have been considering of the Italian princes who occupied the Papal throne was that the Italian peninsula remained for centuries in the condition from which other states of Western Europe were emerging. At the very moment when the hitherto severed provinces of France and Spain were being consolidated into powerful monarchies, when the crowns of England and Scotland were shortly to be united, when the tendency of national aspiration, as manifested in the concerted action of the Protestant states of the German empire and of the Low Countries, was towards union, the efforts of successive pontiffs to establish and extend their temporal possessions resulted in the permanent division of Italy into a number of petty states. It is idle to speculate how much earlier the dream of Italian nationality might have been realized but for the secular policy of the papacy. The rivalry which separated the Northern from the Southern Italian kingdoms was not more deep-seated than that which alienated Aragon from Castille; but the diplomacy, as well as the dominion of the Roman Church was thrust in as a wedge to keep open the cleavage between the Italian principalities. Broadly stated, the maxim of the Papal Foreign office was 'Divide et impera,' and the promotion of dissension between its neighbours became a principle of the first importance. The evils which were caused to Italy by this secular policy were manifold. It

led to the ill-advised invitation of foreign interference, and made the plains of the Po for a season the cockpit of Europe. It impoverished the Italian states by encouraging them in internecine quarrels, in which vast wealth was squandered, whilst all in turn were plundered indiscriminately by French and Spanish troops, alternately their foes and allies. It built up, at an utterly disproportionate cost to the treasury of the Church, a state which was powerless to contend single-handed against its rivals, and which yet possessed a disintegrating force that acted most disastrously upon the fortunes of the country. Nor were its effects less injurious to the papacy itself. Just as the conscience of Europe was awakening and public opinion was beginning to exercise a powerful influence upon the action of nations, it became apparent that the throne of St. Peter had become the prey of unprincipled adventurers, and that the most sacred pretensions were only alleged as a pretext for raising money. What the eventual issue of the papal policy would have been had its tendencies remained unchecked may easily be foreseen. It would have assuredly involved the utter ruin of the papacy. Despite the loss to the Roman obedience of so large a portion of Europe, the Reformation indirectly conferred hardly less benefit upon the Roman Church than it wrought for its own immediate followers. The Pope was called to account as the head of the Christian Church. The voices of godly and able men, who had long abhorred and loudly protested against prevalent corruptions, made themselves heard. Salvation was found through the agency which the selfishness of the Popes dreaded most to employ. The protracted sessions of the Council of Trent led to a change in the morals and discipline of her clergy which availed, in the eyes of hesitating millions, to justify the immemorial position of the papacy.

---



## ART. VII.—TUDOR'S PHILOSOPHY OF CHURCH LIFE.

*The Philosophy of Church Life: or, the Church of Christ viewed as the means whereby God manifests Himself to Mankind.* By the late RICHARD TUDOR, B.A. (London, 1887.)

APOLOGETIC works are of two kinds. One, to which perhaps the name more properly belongs, is purely logical. It proves by clear philosophic or historical argument the truth of the Christian religion or of some fundamental portion of it; it removes objections by showing that they are untrue. It attempts to lay the foundations of faith upon a firm and immovable foundation. It aims at what is absolute, and not merely relative. It tries to rise above chains of reasoning which start from an appeal to conventional beliefs or passing phases of thought. In a word, its object is truth. And upon the success or failure of Christian apologists to show at least reasonable grounds for a belief in the absolute truth of the religion they defend, will depend the ultimate hold which, in any age or country, Christianity has on the highest minds. As soon as theologians begin to rely on documents known to be forged, or on a system of thought known to be false, so soon will men of intellectual power be repelled from it. But if such arguments and supports are necessary as the foundation upon which the truth of Christianity must rest, they have seldom been the means by which men have been attracted to it. Logic may convince, but it seldom wins; historical criticism may confute opponents; but who has ever become a Christian by the magnetic attraction of Lardner's *Credibility*, &c.? The dazzling light of truth guides but does not attract. For it is as cold as the heart warmed only by logic, and as unapproachable as the theology of the Reformers.

Hence the necessity of the second form of Apology, which exhibits Christianity as appealing to the human heart and as meeting human difficulties. It explains, it mediates, it illumines. To the mind repelled by what seem dry dogmas it shows that they are filled with life and correspond to the needs and aspirations of the heart. To the thinker to whom some doctrine seems incoherent and unmeaning it shows how the Christian faith forms an harmonious and consistent whole and gives an adequate explanation of the facts and difficulties

of life. It is the method, not of the lecture, or the theological treatise, or the closet, but of the church, of the sermon, of the world. It wins and attracts men; it converts souls; it convinces where reason often fails. Its method too is different from the higher and more logical forms of apology. The philosophic treatise which defends Christianity ought to eschew the attractions of rhetoric, while the sermon which would win men to Christ relies on rhetoric, not to mislead their reason, but to arouse their feelings. Men's minds are not moved by reason any more than a ship is propelled by its rudder; their hopes and fears, their passions and aspirations must be stirred, and to these rhetoric may rightly appeal.

This second form of apology is essentially subjective in character—that is, it appeals primarily to the views of individuals, not to an absolute standard of truth. It is of two kinds. The first shows that Christianity is an harmonious whole, self-consistent, and self-explaining; the second, that it corresponds to the aspirations and hopes of mankind. And the value of either of these from a logical point of view will vary according to the different cases in which it is applied. That Christianity is a great consistent whole, offering an adequate explanation of the problems of life as propounded by what may be considered the concurrent testimony of philosophers, goes far as a logical proof. The logical proof of the law of evolution or of gravitation is that they afford an adequate explanation of a large class of phenomena. So far there will be a certain objectivity in our argument. But every person sets his own problems for himself and takes his own view of life. If, then, Christianity adequately and consistently answers his questions, it becomes true for him, though on grounds which are of no value to the rest of the world. In the same way, if we can get some objective standard of the spiritual needs and aspirations of mankind, and can show that Christianity responds to these in a way that no other religion does, then again we go far towards establishing a logical proof of its truth. But the spiritual needs often take strange forms: one man is attracted by what repels another. Many a man is won to the Christian faith by arguments which are neither valid nor widely applicable. Again our point of view becomes subjective. The value to individuals of this second class of arguments will depend upon the success with which they are adapted to his point of view. The general value will depend upon the extent to which it is possible to arrive at a common form which will adequately embrace the needs and aspirations of mankind.

per  
Mr.  
to s  
exp  
diff  
life  
in c  
of t  
the  
hum  
high  
we  
lica  
mat  
but  
exc  
littl  
ven  
still  
No  
pat  
the  
said  
Tuc  
to f

It is  
selv  
our  
wou  
trea  
dem  
men  
with

As far as we have been able to judge from a tedious perusal of the two large volumes before us, the aim of the late Mr. Tudor was such as we have just described. He desired to show how Christianity affords an adequate and consistent explanation of the facts of the spiritual life, and how the difficulties which are supposed to surround it vanish, if Church life is viewed as a whole. All that seems to some repellent in doctrine or in creeds really arises from a misapprehension of them or of the needs of mankind. In the teaching of the Church, and in it alone, the spiritual and moral life of humanity receives full satisfaction. Mr. Tudor's aim was a high one, and if he had shown any capacity for carrying it out we should not have quarrelled with his executors for the publication of these weighty and posthumous volumes. As a matter of fact we have a very serious grievance against them, but we must confess that it is purely personal. For, with the exception of the amount of paper and labour expended to little purpose, the book is absolutely innocuous. Few, we venture to prophecy, will succeed in getting very far into it; still fewer will succeed in carrying away from it any clear idea. No one will be able to find anything that is harmful, and with patience some few grains of solid value may be gleaned from the depressing verbosity of the author. Our quarrel, we have said, is a personal one. We have been compelled to study Mr. Tudor's *Church Life* somewhat minutely, and any who attempt to follow us will appreciate our feelings of resentment.

For, in the first place, the book is dull—

'Peter was dull—he was at first  
Dull—oh, so dull—so very dull!  
Whether he talked, wrote, or rehearsed,  
Still with this dulness was he cursed—  
Dull—beyond all conception—dull.

'Even the Reviewers who were hired  
To do the work of his reviewing  
With adamant nerves grew tired;  
Gaping and torpid they retired  
To dream of what they should be doing.'

It is sometimes said that all theological works are in themselves dull (a statement the fallacy of which a reference to our own pages will show), and of course no one, as Aristotle would say, would expect the same merits from a theological treatise as from a Gaiety burlesque. But we may legitimately demand a certain amount of logical and systematic arrangement, a style which expresses what the author desires to say without using more than twice as many words as are necessary,

and some capacity for thinking and writing clearly. In fact, though graces of style are unnecessary or even harmful in a theological treatise, there is no work in which the merits of a good style are more apparent. Mr. Tudor unfortunately shows every fault of which a writer can be guilty. He is lengthy and verbose; he has overloaded his work with an awkward phraseology which he reproduces with a wearisome persistence; he consumes pages of print and much time with a turgid and wordy rhetoric. He devotes so much attention to preliminary matter and previous exceptions that he never comes to the point, or if he does get there he does not take his readers with him. It is always wearisome to quote extracts of what is bad only because it is dull; it is quite sufficient proof of our statement to refer our readers to any page at which they like to open the book. We will confine ourselves to a very few passages.

'We hold, therefore, that the truest and highest conception of personality, in plainer words, of the personal life, is to be found, not in the I AM and I WILL as standing out individualized in an absolute impassive self-isolation and self-sufficiency, but rather as finding itself and being defined as an individual subsistence by going out from, and returning in upon, itself in eternal loving co-relation with the Thou and the He' (ii. 37).

This is an excellent example of the use of phraseology to mystify readers. Hardly a page can be opened in the first part of the second volume without the eye being struck by the pedantic use of the terms I AM and I WILL, in place and out of place. In other parts of the book other phrases occupy conspicuous places and grate on the ear with distressing frequency. 'Special positive revelation,' the 'All and the one' are great favourites.

The following is an instance of thoroughly bad rhetoric:—

'In our sacred writings no heroes of a golden age pass before our view, no mythic figures *ready cut and dried, no brilliant parterres all aglow in glittering colours, with sudden transformations come and go, like the quickly shifting patterns in the kaleidoscope*' (ii. 222).

Is it the 'mythic figures' who have been already 'cut and dried' and banished to a museum, or the 'brilliant parterres' that are able to come and go? In another place Mr. Tudor writes:—

'The prophets were true prophets of God; but being men of like passions with ourselves, so while they wrote they thought of time, yet the Hand which held them grasped eternity' (ii. 205).

What does the writer mean to say? And what do his words mean?

skip

supe

I Al

to la

secu

this

judg

we a

spea

yet,

to J

Lore

grou

cons

have

unw

One

God

We

Mr.

ten

gra

the

reli

rea

of

whi

sid

aim

bar

als

tio

sta

ma

Hi

rat

aut

con

do

wo

on

spe

so

One more quotation (which we recommend our readers to skip) and we have done.

'Yet from that criticism, which would bid us quench the flame supernatural and stifle the breath of life divine with its long loud I AM and I WILL, and thus rob the Bible of its living soul in order to lay the disorganized corpse upon its dissecting tables, to be cut up *secundum artem* into a thousand disjointed shrivelled fragments, and this simply that it may come within the boundary lines of man's judgment and correction, as a mere human natural product; though we are free to confess that we ourselves hold not its divining rod, and speak not as one of the initiated, and lay no claim to its omniscience, yet, passing by both ourselves and them, we with full confidence appeal to Jesus Christ—the Son and Word of God, to the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, and to the living Church—"the pillar and ground of the truth"—which, with the sacred instincts of the duly constituted witness and keeper of holy writ, howsoever much she may have differed in its interpretation, has ever held, with one consistent unwavering tradition, that the Bible is the One living Book of the One living God, imparted by the One Spirit to the One Church of God' (ii. 11).

We do not wish to say anything against the excellence of Mr. Tudor's principles, but the above sentence (for it is intended to be a complete sentence) hardly succeeds in being grammatical, and its argumentative value is nil. It represents the solution of a problem by the copious employment of religious phraseology.

As we do not wish to rival our author in wearying our readers, we have probably given them quite enough instances of his style. But from time to time works are produced which, though of no literary merit, are distinguished by considerable philosophic capacity, though the writer appears to aim at increasing the difficulty of an obscure subject by the barbarity of his style. This work is unfortunately destitute also of any real philosophic value. To carry out its conception properly some knowledge of modern philosophy and of standard works of theology would be necessary. Mr. Tudor may have an acquaintance with such books; he never uses it. His references are throughout to a limited number of second-rate books, and we seldom find any knowledge of works of authority. The longest section of the work is devoted to considering the relation of Christian doctrine to morality. To do this adequately some acquaintance with moral philosophy would be necessary; the writer has absolutely none. He has one second-hand reference to Kant, but a good deal of his speculation seems to come from that philosopher as its ultimate source, though after filtering through one or more interme-

diaries. Of the questions and difficulties of modern science he is also ignorant, although he often talks about science. He discusses the fall of man and the origin of evil without any reference to difficulties raised by the theory of evolution. He not only does not always give adequate answers to the questions he does ask; he does not ask the questions to which people require answers. To use a rather disagreeable expression, he is out of touch with the times.

But not only is he destitute of the material necessary to carry out his scheme; he is also destitute of the ability. Not only are his arguments ill expressed; they are often bad. Of such we have collected two or three examples. One is the argument from quotations. This is of value in certain places: for example, in a political meeting a Conservative can always prove anything he likes from the speeches of Mr. Gladstone, and a Liberal will often be able to corroborate his views by an isolated statement of Lord Salisbury. Such a style of argument is admirably adapted for political warfare, but is decidedly out of place in a sober theological treatise, unless the quotations be either from writers who are accepted as authorities, or have been quoted for literary purposes. To bring forward a list of modern theological writers who have said creeds are valuable, and to end with asserting that they must be so because even Canon Kingsley has said it, is a very poor method of proof. Canon Kingsley is not a Pope or a Father, and, except for purposes of party warfare, a quotation of his 'authority' is worthless. An assertion by Mr. Bradlaugh that Christianity had not always been detrimental to mankind would have no philosophic value at all. Nor is another logical figure which Mr. Tudor employs of much higher value. We may call it the argument of religious phraseology; we have quoted an instance of it above, and need not burden our readers with further references. The method is: 'on arriving at the point of your argument, pour forth a flood of commonplace religious phraseology which will be very grateful to your orthodox hearers and will overwhelm your opponents. We recognize the value of such a form of argument in its proper place. It is used with great effect in preaching sermons to congregations who absolutely agree with the preacher and are unassailed by doubt, but to whom it is comforting to hear infidel theories confronted with their favourite phrases. It has a logical value, which is that it reminds the hearers that the doctrines which are being attacked are inconsistent with principles that are undoubted—the conclusion, of course, is that they must be untrue. Now

such  
but  
terrib  
The  
which  
digni  
know  
desir  
It ge  
theor  
of its  
logic  
Mr. T  
Scrip  
elem  
beca  
in m  
by r  
argu  
A  
lish  
is ge  
and  
that  
how  
cont  
spiri  
We  
whic  
requ

the  
we  
to b  
that  
Hur  
side  
the  
met  
in t  
plan  
trut  
bec  
seq



such a form of reasoning is perfectly legitimate in its place, but not in a learned theological treatise. It is not only terribly dull; it also fails to satisfy a too inquiring reason. The third method of reasoning which Mr. Tudor has used, which, however valuable in its place, we hardly think suits the dignity of his work, is the 'argument in a circle.' We have known this used with great effect by those speakers who desire to convince their hearers of what they know already. It generally takes the form either of proving one half of a theory by the other, or of proving a theory by a paraphrase of itself stated in different language. It again may have the logical value of showing that a statement is self-consistent. Mr. Tudor in one place devotes some time to proving from the Scriptures that man contains a spiritual as well as a material element, and then shows that the Scriptures must be true because they correspond to the spiritual and material element in mankind, being themselves half human, half divine: written by men, but written by men who are inspired. Such an argument has a certain value, but that value is limited.

Although Mr. Tudor occasionally fails both to write English and to reason correctly, his book is not destitute of what is good. He was, we believe, a hard-working parish priest, and an earnest and good man. From his book we conclude that we should have valued him as a personal friend and pastor, however little we should have cared to hear him preach. It contains isolated thoughts and ideas which are not without spiritual insight. He is sympathetic, earnest, and conscientious. We shall attempt, therefore, to collect some of his thoughts which deserve to be more clearly stated, and some which require correction.

The first section of the book is introductory, and explains the author's point of view. There are two ways in which we may look at human life: either we may consider it to be a mere development of animal life, or we may recognize that it offers a far more complex problem to be solved. Human life consists of two elements: there is the material side, on which man is linked to the animal world, and there is the spiritual, on which he is linked to God. Mr. Tudor's method is to assume this duality of human nature and show, in the first place, that it offers a much more consistent explanation of the facts of life, and, secondly, that, granted its truth, the existence of the supernatural element in the world becomes natural, and the fact of revelation is a necessary consequence. Christianity, therefore, as revealed in the Christian

Church is a systematic and consistent whole, answering to all the needs of mankind.

The original starting-point is never proved. But the importance of this method of argument, if well carried out, may be illustrated from two instances which Mr. Tudor gives, and which we will reproduce, using somewhat terser language than he does.

Our readers are probably well acquainted with the current arguments both for and against miracles—they recognize that the celebrated argument, that it is more likely that human beings should lie than that a law of nature should be violated, is somewhat difficult to answer with equal epigrammatic brevity. But have they ever known anyone whose disbelief in miracles arose from this argument? Have they ever known anyone who has deliberately sat down 'in a cool moment' to calculate the chances either way, and has come to the conclusion on purely logical grounds? Such a man would certainly be *ἡ θηρίον ἢ θεός*, as Aristotle says. But there are numbers of men who have learnt to disbelieve in miracles, but in a different way—not by logic (whether good or bad), but by habit. By constantly attending to the laws of nature, and to those laws only; by becoming accustomed to an unaltering and apparently unalterable uniformity; by filling their minds with the idea of an utterly remorseless force always working, a wheel of fate whose evolutions can never be checked, they become unable to grasp any other conception. They have so much imagination that at any period of the world's history or in any class of phenomena they can always see the principles they are accustomed to at work, but they have not enough to conceive other principles; their minds are so overwhelmed by the engrossing study of the realm of law, that they are quite unable to conceive this law as being ever interrupted. In answer to all arguments they can simply, like Carlyle, make a dogmatic assertion—'a miracle is impossible; there is nothing more to be said.'

Against such a state of mind logic is valueless. A man must be induced to change his point of view and look at that side of the facts which he has so completely ignored. If once he looks upon the universe, not as a process of mindless matter, but as the constant exercise of a spiritual activity; if he realizes that the laws which he has assumed to be equally unyielding and equally inexplicable are really the manifestations of a power which is unchanging because it is divine, a power which takes a constant and regular part in the government of the world, then what seemed inconceivable

beco  
it is  
asse  
a mi  
will  
still  
mor  
bein  
univ  
need  
posi  
caus  
mira  
faith  
mor  
orde  
thos  
ence  
phil  
tell  
the  
with  
Chri  
but

mir  
the  
cons  
hum  
idea  
ther  
char  
tion  
that  
We  
grac  
the  
poli  
hero  
form  
sett  
grew  
of c  
nati  
Pers

becomes comprehensible: a miracle is still supernatural, for it is outside nature, but it is not impossible, for it is the self-assertion of the originator and controller of the universe; a miracle will still demand evidence, but historical evidence will not be asked to prove what is impossible. A miracle will still require an adequate cause, and the cause must be the moral good of the universe; for the hypothesis of a supreme being is primarily adopted to explain the moral facts of the universe; and this intervention will only be justified by the need of his moral supervision. But granting these two—supposing satisfactory historical evidence and an adequate moral cause to have been given, then the difficulty of believing in a miracle ceases. A miracle is no longer a heavy tax upon faith, but a support. The argument in fact is this: granted a moral Deity, he will supervise the morality of the world; in order to assert his power he will abrogate in certain instances those laws of which he is the author; he will extend his influence among men by the gifts of inspiration. This is what philosophy would tell us to expect, and what history does tell us has happened. It will be seen that we have assumed the existence of a moral Deity, and this shows the limits within which the argument is valuable; the fact remains that Christianity looked at from without may seem 'impossible,' but looked at from within is a clear and well-ordered whole.

A one-sided view of the facts of nature makes a belief in miracles almost impossible; a one-sided view of history makes the fact of revelation out of place. A philosopher of history constructs an elaborate theory in his mind, which makes the human race, by the laws of psychology or the influence of ideas, develop harmoniously, regularly, systematically. Where, then, can revelation come? Is it not impossible? But change the point of view. Assume that the Christian revelation is true: then let us examine history, and we shall find that at any rate something may be said on the other side. We look at the course of history, and we see how slowly and gradually the human race developed until it became fit for the revelation of Christ. We can trace this development in politics, in thought, in morals, in religion. From the original herdlike life, in which men and women lived together in varied forms of union, the family was developed. By conquest, by settlement, by trade, by the needs of self-defence, the family grew into the tribe, the clan, the city, and the state. Still love of conquest and commercial activity asserted themselves, the nations grew larger, and human intercourse more extended. Persia, Alexander, and Carthage prepared the way for Rome,

and by the Roman empire the world was at length prepared for a world-extensive religion. Philosophy, religion, and morals had all reached a stage when the world was fitted for a higher and more complete revelation. Then, 'in the fulness of time, Christ came into the world.' We are not engaged at present in proving the truth of revelation: that is for our purpose assumed. We do not presume to discuss the Why of the Creator's purpose. There the Christian agnostic may claim to be heard. Our object is to show that if from an external point of view the Christian revelation is a disturbing element in the world's history, looked at from within it is an adequate, a complete, and satisfactory account of the facts of the past. Even if it were only an hypothesis it would have all the merits of a good hypothesis. Christianity can satisfy those who understand it; it cannot satisfy those who are so absorbed in their own hypothesis that they cannot approach any other.

Mr. Tudor's second book is devoted to what he calls the 'divine self-manifestation.' He divides revelation into 'the divine self-communication' and 'the divine self-manifestation.' This division is one of considerable value in bringing out the double aspect of revelation, and would, perhaps, be of greater value if it were not dwelt on with such distressing frequency. The object of the Incarnation was, not merely to reveal God to mankind, but to impart God to mankind by the union between the two natures. In this book Mr. Tudor devotes himself to the revelation viewed as the divine self-manifestation.

The first duty, then, is to determine the relation of revelation to human knowledge and thought. On this subject Mr. Tudor has some remarks which deserve quoting, whether as examples of his inimitable style or of his singularly confused thought.

'And thus we maintain that with consentient utterance, howsoever varied the actual sounds, from all creation, whether visible or invisible, in heaven or earth, or under the earth—all everywhere, from the devil and his angels to Michael, the prince of the heavenly host, from the grain of sand carried by the wind to the mighty orbs that revolve in illimitable space, from the tiny insect dancing in the sunbeams to the profound philosopher who instructs mankind—one voice goes up' (i. 150).

We had always thought that 'the devil was a liar and the father of lies;' we had also been accustomed to hold that there was such a thing as absolute error—any interpretation of this passage of Dr. Tudor's which started on the assumption that there was a fixed and definite meaning to words would be bound to deny both these statements. But appa-

rently  
not t  
place  
that s  
to fac  
tion, I  
unsce  
is tru  
true ;  
scienc  
that c

H  
he sur

'(a  
(b) sec  
nition  
capabi  
termin

TH  
value  
many  
comm  
is ag  
There  
there  
knowl  
Huma  
it can  
ing. T  
and K  
Spenc  
effort  
The n  
argum  
has p  
lutely  
argum  
of the  
comm  
long a  
temati  
the m  
can de  
revela

VOL

rently all he means to say is that philosophy and science are not to be despised—a very excellent, if somewhat commonplace, remark. To say this, however, he begins by asserting that science is always right, and then when he is brought face to face with absolute opposition between science and revelation, he evades the difficulty by saying that such science is unscientific, is falsely so called. Now, of course, if revelation is true, anything in science which contradicts it must be untrue; but we have no right first to assert dogmatically that science and revelation are one, and then to denounce anything that does not please us as not true science.

However, we find something far better further on, when he sums up the value of a scientific philosophy to revelation.

‘(a) First, it helps in clearing the ground by eradicating error; (b) secondly, it indicates the problem to be solved, by accurate definition of its nature and extent, and by the delimitation of its own capabilities and range; and (c) thirdly, it prepares a scientific abstract terminology and a logical method’ (i. 176).

These three propositions seem to us to sum up the true value of philosophy admirably. We might illustrate them in many ways. Perhaps one instance will be sufficient. It is a common complaint against philosophy that its ultimate answer is agnosticism. We cannot know beyond certain limits. There is a world of experience of which we have knowledge; there is (or may be) a world beyond of which we have no knowledge. Man must be content to remain in ignorance. Human reason has its definite limits, and beyond these limits it cannot go. This has a hopeless side, yet it is really consoling. This modern agnosticism, the parents of which are Hume and Kant, whose latest exponents are Mansell and Herbert Spencer, may be disastrous to religion, as the result of human effort; it is really a support to religion as the gift of revelation. The negative criticism of Kant has, it is true, made certain arguments in favour of Christianity of much less value, but it has practically introduced new arguments, and it has absolutely overthrown a whole mass of negative criticism; *a priori* arguments against the truth of Christianity lose a great deal of their value. But it has done more: it has put a limit to the common speculations which have hampered Christianity. So long as the human mind devotes itself to interpreting, to systematizing, to expressing in accurate language, to developing the meaning of revelation, it is acting within spheres where it can do so with safety. If it once steps beyond the limits of revelation, it enters regions where it has no guide, and where

it wanders without a track to follow, and uncontrolled by experience. Reason spins cobwebs out of itself which sometimes are with difficulty swept away. The history of the doctrine of the Trinity shows how all the resources of philosophy may be used to systematize revelation and supply phraseology for it. Logic interprets the subject-matter which revelation has supplied. But a good deal of later speculation, Byzantine, scholastic, Protestant—upon the origin of evil and the doctrine of free will—all those systems which have obscured the true facts of Christianity and have burdened many minds may be swept away. The true value of philosophy is critical. It removes error and explains truth.

We have not space nor do we think that it would be worth our while to follow Mr. Tudor's speculations through the remainder of this work. He has grasped many admirable principles, but he does not show much skill in using them. To assign its proper place to human speculation, to look upon Christianity as a whole, and a whole revealed, not in the Bible only, but also in the Church, to view the problems of life in the light of the Incarnation—these great principles he recognizes; but we do not find that he shows any skill in applying them. He does not see difficulties clearly; he often fails to answer them. He allows his pen to carry him away with a fatal fluency. In discussing the origin of evil he sees that it must be due to a great spiritual catastrophe; but he never sees how that catastrophe can be reconciled with the teaching of science. He says a good deal about 'moral determinism' and so on, but never clearly either asks or answers the question, How is this consistent with the goodness of God?

Amongst the many topics and questions touched upon in the second volume one leading one stands out conspicuously: How does Christianity satisfy the spiritual and the moral needs of mankind? We shall say something on both points.

Mr. Tudor sums up and crystallizes his teaching in a passage which is considerably more epigrammatic than is usual with him.

'The attributes of personality, as exhibited by God and man respectively, in some important particulars differ, in others agree. They differ, inasmuch as God consists of three Persons in one nature, while man consists of three natures in one person; this antithesis, however, so far from proving a bar to intercommunion, becomes the very source of its feasibility. They agree together inasmuch as both participate in the essential characteristics of personality—self-conscious being and self-determining will' (ii. 116).

Here there is a great deal that is true and a great deal, too, which is absolutely false. The essence of Christianity is in



the double recognition of personality in man and in God. But the analogy or antithesis which is based upon the recurrence of the number three in the person of the Godhead and in an assumed psychology is the worst form of mysticism. What practically leads Mr. Tudor astray is a false analogy. The number three does occur in both ; but if the analogy is to hold good there must be some resemblance between the three natures and the three persons ; as a matter of fact there is none at all. Our three natures are the body, soul, and spirit, and these cannot in any way be said to have any real analogy to the three Persons of the Trinity. We will not attempt to analyze the passage, for we fear that the contrast would become blasphemous.

In fact, this passage contains an example of mysticism of the worst sort, and as there is a strong tendency in Mr. Tudor's book towards mysticism, sometimes legitimate, sometimes illegitimate, we shall attempt to define the limits within which it may be used.

Mysticism is, we venture to suggest, the discovery of a spiritual meaning or of spiritual life, whether in Scripture or in nature, where it is not found to be by reason. The mystical man sees God and His Spirit everywhere ; his spiritual insight gives a new value to the most commonplace things : 'mountain, grove, and stream, the earth, and every common sight' appear to him 'apparalled in celestial light, the glory and the brightness of a dream.'

Now reason will tell the mystic that, if the teaching of Christianity is true, the earth does represent everywhere the working of a Divine power. It will tell him that there is no cause why he should not hold the storm clouds and the rain and the thunder to be messengers of God to do his will. Reason cannot guide him to discover them : that is the duty of the inspired imagination or spiritual insight, which is the parent of mysticism ; but it will not forbid him to believe in them. The following passage, therefore, from a volume of well-known sermons, is equally beautiful and true ; it is an admirable example of true mysticism :—

'I do not pretend to say that we are told in Scripture what Matter is ; but I affirm that as our souls move our bodies, be our bodies what they may, so there are spiritual Intelligences which move those wonderful and vast portions of the natural world which seem to be inanimate ; and as the gestures, speech, and expressive countenances of our friends around us enable us to hold intercourse with them, so in the motions of universal Nature, in the interchange of day and night, summer and winter, wind and storm, fulfilling His word, we

are reminded of the blessed and dutiful Angels. . . . Whenever we look abroad we are reminded of those most precious and holy Beings, the servants of the Holiest, who deign to minister to the heirs of salvation. Every breath of air and ray of light and heat, every beautiful prospect is, as it were, the skirts of their garments, the waving of the robes of those whose faces see God in heaven. And I put it to anyone, whether it is not as philosophical and as full of intellectual enjoyment, to refer the movements of the natural world to them, as to attempt to explain them by certain theories of science ; useful as these theories certainly are for particular purposes, and capable (in subordination to that higher view) of a religious application.'<sup>1</sup>

So far may mysticism go ; but when it attempts to build up a hierarchy of angels with mystical names ; when it attempts to build up theology in fancied interpretations of the topography of Jerusalem or the structure of the human body ; when it allows itself to be carried astray by arbitrary numerical analogies ; when it takes fancy as its guide, and casts off the restraint of reason, it is in danger of raising a structure so absurd as to endanger and bring contempt on religion itself.

It would be wandering too far to attempt to distinguish the limits of the mystical interpretation as applied to Scripture.<sup>2</sup> We believe that the same principle that we have enunciated, that of not allowing the fancy to take the place of reason, is a sound one. What we wish to emphasize is the importance of self-restraint in this matter. A speaker at the Wolverhampton Church Congress (1887), in a paper in many ways able, has dwelt on the 'beauty and charm' of the mystical sense. Any knowledge of the lives of spiritually-minded men will bear this out. Amongst orthodox and unorthodox, in ancient and modern times alike, with the learned and able, with the unlettered and uninstructed, wherever there have been spiritually-minded men, there the mystical interpretation of nature and of Scripture has been popular. We have suggested that it is legitimate within certain limits, but carried beyond those limits it becomes constantly liable to error ; it is a danger to which spiritually-minded men are especially liable ; it is a corruption which arises from unrestrained indulgence in what is highest in their nature ; but it is dangerous, for it often leads to error, and it causes a stumbling-block to many, turning them away from the truth of Christianity.

We have said enough of mysticism. We will add a few words on the answer to the question which we believe Mr. Tudor puts before himself in this section of his work. How

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, ii. 361.

<sup>2</sup> This subject is discussed at length in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1882 (vol. xxii. pp. 22-64).

does Christianity, and especially how does Christianity as a dogmatic system, satisfy the spiritual needs of mankind? In many ways he has answered it well, but what is good in his writings is so mixed up with what is confused, and so obscurely stated, that we shall attempt to epitomize his views for the benefit of our readers.

Man naturally yearns after a personal God; Christianity grants his wish. His own personality, freedom of the will, and moral responsibility are the very basis of his life. Christianity establishes these on a sure foundation. Man yearns after union with God; he seeks help amid his struggles and sympathy for his weakness. Now can this be granted without violating the sternness of monotheism? Christianity answers by the mystery of the Incarnation. Man's intellect demands an abstract, unanthropomorphic God: his religious instinct demands a God who came down to man, a God who is man; his intellect proves the remoteness of God 'in the highest heavens:' his religious feelings ask for the grace of God continually present in his heart: Christianity answers by the mystery of the Trinity. Mankind asks for a sure basis for that belief in immortality which seems instinctive: Christianity points with undoubting heart to the historical fact of the Resurrection.

The last portion of Mr. Tudor's book is devoted to the connexion between the Christian revelation and morality. It is, we think, the most successful portion of the work. He starts with the premisses that the moral needs of man demand: I. The Universal; II. The Personal; III. Perfectibility.

'I. The Universal: the ethical ideal, *i.e.* the moral, or what ought to be, and must be, the all-embracing aim and the absolute criterion of human morality—the highest Good.

'II. The Personal: the morally good to be practically fulfilled in and by the individual man, as the aim or object of his free will and personal self-government, exercised with reference to the ideal—Duty.

'III. Perfectibility: the process of actually attaining to the ideal—*i.e.* the morally good, considered as realizable in the fulfilment of duty by the individual subject, as the supreme object of human existence—Virtue' (ii. 269).

Now the logical value of this method of argument for Christian defence will depend upon the degree of universality which these premisses have. For example, they may only express the individual wants of a single person, or they may be true for all mankind. And it is just at this point that

Mr. Tudor's ignorance of philosophy hampers him. He cannot find a thoroughly solid basis on which to start. No one can, we think, fail to see the resemblance which these bear to much of the moral teaching of Kant. In fact, we imagine that they would be found to be derived eventually from him. But Mr. Tudor betrays no consciousness of this resemblance. Yet he would have added very much to the strength of his argument had he been able to give a philosophic basis, if not of argument at any rate of authority, to his fundamental assumptions.

Mr. Tudor works out the application of these principles with his usual fulness. But he does not seem to see clearly the point where the argument fails. The fact is that these three moral principles of mankind may be equally satisfied by an elevated philosophy or a bare monotheism. Christianity more nearly satisfies mankind because it responds to even deeper human needs. Man is not satisfied with a response to his intellectual demands for duty, virtue, and the highest good, for his moral nature must be stirred by an appeal to his emotions. It is here that Christianity, in her central doctrine of love, does what no other religion can do, whether exhibited by God for man, or imparted to man by God.

We have, we think, put before our readers the main points of a book the publication of which we cannot help regretting. We do not think we have treated it unfairly; we have honestly endeavoured to bring out such merits as we feel it possesses, but we have felt bound (especially after one or two notices of the work we have seen) to emphasize its very considerable defects. The cause of Christianity is only hindered by the use of unsound arguments. We must allow no flaw in our bayonets, and no bad powder in our cartridges. Christian defence must always rest on a firm basis.

But the thought of what Mr. Tudor has tried to do has brought vividly before our minds the idea of what we hope some one will succeed in doing. Each succeeding age requires to have Christianity presented to it in a form corresponding to its changed needs. For difficulties and doubts present themselves which, if not new, appear at any rate new. Questions arise which require a practical solution. Philosophy changes its direction and its terminology. The fundamental truths of Christianity must be restated and redefended. What Origen did for the third century, what Hooker did for the seventeenth century, must be done also for the nineteenth. And the time seems to have come, too, when it may be done. Science seems to have ceased to generalize, and to have taken refuge in specialism. Philo-

sophy and history have ceased to be fertile and reproductive. Little addition will probably be made to our store of thought by changes in political life or commercial activity. To a long period of discovery and invention has succeeded one in which we can only perfect the work of our predecessors. And just at this time a man is wanted who has grasped and comprehended the teaching of philosophy, science, and life, who has a firm hold of the truths of Christianity, who working under the guidance of inspired reason will systematize, codify, and rearrange a philosophy of Church life which will respond to all the needs and aspirations of the day.

---

ART. VIII.—‘CASWELL’—‘THE NEW ANTIGONE’—  
‘ROBERT ELSMERE.’

1. *Caswell: A Paradox*. Two vols. (London, 1887.)
2. *The New Antigone: A Romance*. Second edition, 2 vols. (London, 1888.)
3. *Robert Elsmere*. By Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD, author of *Miss Bretherton*. Second edition, 3 vols. (London, 1888.)

It is altogether too late in the history of modern literature to discuss the legitimacy of presenting distinctly religious questions through the medium of fiction. Whatever fundamental objections—and there are some very serious and solid ones—may be advanced against the practice, it is now so generally adopted that we must content ourselves with criticizing such examples as may be brought before us, and with determining whether they treat sacred things in a reverent spirit and with adequate knowledge. Nor is this all which we have a right to require of those who select this method of enforcing their religious opinions. It is essential that they should observe—on the supposition that a writer's aim is not victory, but truth—that due sense of proportion which is demanded by the limitations of their art. For it is an absolute necessity of novel writing that the author should leave out many of the facts which in real life would modify the impression produced on the reader's mind, and it is exactly in this process of selection for a definite purpose that the danger lies. The inevitable *suppressio veri* slides so easily into the *suggestio falsi*. More

especially is this the case when the direct intent and object of a writer is not to excite emotion, but to persuade; not to work upon the feelings, but to master the judgment. In the former case a fragment of truth may legitimately effect the desired purpose. In the latter the reader has a moral right to have a fair statement of all pertinent facts by which his decision should be guided.

These truths suggest to us a further caution as to the special difficulty inseparable from all religious novels. Religious emotion is at once most liable to exaggeration and unreality, and at the same time ought, more than any other shade of feeling, to be pourtrayed with a tender and reverent touch. Religious knowledge, on the other hand—or rather the knowledge which can guide to any trustworthy conclusion upon subjects of religious controversy—should be both ample and accurate. Yet it is almost unavoidable that the religious novelist should exactly reverse this relative proportion. To interest and enlist sympathy he will enlarge upon the emotional and curtail the argumentative portion of his story. Of course each writer is entitled to choose his own method of putting his views before the world, and it is for the reviewer to point out any fallacy or unfairness into which he has been betrayed.

These thoughts have been suggested by the study of the three works before us. They might all be included under the general title of religious novels, although *Caswell* and *The New Antigone* stand in marked contrast, both of subject and tone, from *Robert Elsmere*. The first two have some important elements in common. The *raison d'être* of each is to narrate a story of sin and shame. They both deal with sin, as distinct from crime, with an adequate sense of its intrinsic horror and of its awful consequences. They are both inspired by the determination to treat the grave question of man's violation of God's law of purity from the standpoint of Christian truth. There is no tricking out of a melodramatic scoundrel in such guise as may be calculated to beguile the reader's sympathy. There is no under-current of excuse for faults which society is wont too generally to visit with half-hearted disapproval. There is no endeavour to palliate yielding to temptation. It may be that both their authors have been led to an almost extreme severity by their distrust of a modern doctrine—which, if it contain some truth, is often stated with perilous incaution—that acquaintance with evil places the penitent in a position of vantage as compared with those of purer life and more limited experience. But the clear, strong,



moral tone of both is refreshing after a shoal of fetid tales in which authors insult their readers as incapable of taking interest in a story unless it is seasoned with impurity. No one could rise from reading them without having his abhorrence of evil deepened and his moral nature braced by their perusal. But it is time to enter upon a separate examination of each of the works before us. We will take them in the order in which they stand at the head of our paper, and will commence with *Caswell*.

A brief outline of the story is indispensable. John Caswell, the illegitimate child of Sir Henry Branston, mayor and most important citizen of the manufacturing town of Linford, is adopted and brought up by his maternal uncle in a remote Cheshire village. The boy, who does not bear his mother's name, inherits a nature instinct with passion from his father; his uncle, the only companion of his early years, is engrossed upon a ponderous work which is to solve the deepest problems of philosophy, and trains his charge to thirst for the one great good in man's imperfect state, viz. fulness of knowledge. A lonely childhood, passed in an atmosphere that is purely intellectual, naturally leads to the indulgence of day-dreams. As time goes on 'he seems to be living two lives—the commonplace life of study and the ecstatic life of contemplation,' in which he holds fancied communion with the world-spirit. The child is father of the man. The early development of mystic spiritual faculties, added to the sensuous but as yet undeveloped nature, influence his whole after life, and lend probability to the experience through which he passes in the protracted agony of his conversion. Removal to Oxford and environment with all the charms of art and poetry arouse the slumbering sensuousness of his nature, and acquaintance with a beautiful but vain and self-indulgent shopgirl leads him into flagrant sin. Then comes a speedy disenchantment. He loathes and leaves the woman he has seduced, and in the bitterness of his disappointment abandons himself to unbridled dissipation. For Delilah's sake he hates what is lovely in woman, and strives to corrupt it; he hates himself no less for the degradation to which he voluntarily descends. It is a striking portrait of a storm-tossed soul, utterly miserable, yet persistent in its indulgence in sin. Gradually there comes the longing for the purity so blindly sacrificed, and now so utterly unattainable; but the length and severity of the struggle are proportionate to the infamy and intensity of the fall. When peace is at length vouchsafed he returns home to seek for and, if possible, to save the girl whom he

has led into sin. He now takes orders; but his efforts to find Delilah only succeed in bringing him to the dying bed, from which she loads him with curses; and his work as a priest is wrecked time after time by the denunciation of George Sampson, the despised and deformed but persistent lover of Delilah. It is an intensely painful story. But the paradox of real success under apparent failure is brought out in the peace that crowns his last hours, and in the hope, faintly suggested in the closing lines, that the conversion of his father, who has only learned his relationship to Caswell in this final scene, may be the last earthly triumph of his loving, mournful ministry.

The necessities of our space compel us to confine our attention to the central figure, but the book abounds in strongly drawn and varied characters. The pictures of Miss Caswell's faithful but unrequited love, cherished through forty desolate years; of the bachelor uncle awakening to the selfishness of his exclusive devotion to his self-imposed engrossing task, and then bowing down before the 'lost love' of the Crucified, and destroying the idol of a lifetime; of society in Linford with its coteries and their petty affectations, now fluttering with the excitement of university lectures delivered by junior dons, who are not a little astonished at the attentions they obtain, now developing religious sympathies under the addresses of Lord Rawyuth, which collapse speedily when the thrilling presence of a live peer is withdrawn; of Caswell's Oxford friends, and Esther Branstons and Lilian Brankwells—all are vividly sketched, whilst they are kept in due subordination to the main purpose of the narrative. A far more important place is filled by the chronicles of Zion Chapel and its worshippers. The practical influence of the narrow Baptist dogma and its effect upon lives wholly absorbed by daily toil and Calvinistic theology are brought out with a power that recalls some of the masterpieces of English fiction. Take the following sympathetic but truthful portrait of Delilah's saintly mother, bowed down by the sorrow of her child's desertion and by the stern pressure of her iron creed:—

'Her friendship with George Sampson had been renewed upon the basis of their common love and longing. No words of religious experience or holy counsel passed between them now. George had by this time drifted far away from his old faith, and when the brethren of Zion Chapel talked half-sadly, half-complacently of his hopeless reprobation, Mrs. Rayner never demurred, and in her heart she thought that they were right. But he was still dear to her, and he seemed to her one link with Delilah. She was resigned to their perdition, and in the midst of the joys of heaven she would perhaps

forg  
ther  
selv  
pres  
Geo  
tion  
hor  
sug  
be e  
own  
any

of t  
is e  
tion

And  
suc  
to u  
The  
dev  
that  
plin  
hea  
app  
is w  
we  
rea  
than  
dist  
a m  
to e

from  
prob  
nob  
han  
scri  
but  
so l  
seas  
of h  
sust

forget them, but while her earthly life lasted she could not grow cold to them. Now and then, when her rebellious affections asserted themselves with a vigour which for the moment overcame her strong repression, her yearning for her child grew so intense, that she envied George the companionship with her in eternal woe which his damnation would bring. But from such thoughts she always recoiled in horror, not dreading pain for herself, but shrinking from the mere suggestion of a murmur against that holy will of God, which would be expressed as much in her bliss as in their pain. She was not her own, she was bought with a price; what right had she to wish for anything but that which God had chosen for her?' (vol. ii. pp. 36, 37).

To form a just estimate of the author's success, the purpose of the story should be steadily before the reader's mind. It is entitled a paradox, and on the title-page is the brief quotation from Mr. Browning's *Rabbi Ben Ezra* :—

Thence—a paradox  
Which comforts while it mocks,—  
Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail.

And the author's view of life is clearly this, that substantial success is often achieved behind apparent failure. This seems to us the undertone of various episodes embraced by the story. The unrequited love of Miss Caswell; the blind devotion of the old book-worm, crowned by the sacrifice of that on which his life had been lavished; the rigid self-discipline which suppressed the very love-throbs of a mother's heart in Mrs. Rayner—these are surely not the failures they appear. But that which is suggested in these minor instances is writ out large in John Caswell himself, and it is here that we have met with some dissatisfaction. It is said that the reader is more impressed eventually with the hero's failure than with his success; that its force is impaired by a want of distinctness in the author's treatment; and that the result is a measure of uncertainty in the spiritual lesson it is designed to enforce.

Now we regard this as a misapprehension which arises from not taking duly into account all the conditions of the problem. It would have been an easier—would it have been a nobler or a more truthful presentation?—to have adopted off-hand the motto 'Great sinners, great saints,' and to have described Caswell after his conversion as carrying all before him; but in real life things do not flow so smoothly. After a fall so low the return was far more likely to be accompanied by seasons of mournful reaction, of utter weariness and deadness of heart, through which the mystic, yearning, loving nature is sustained to the end. If George Simpson is allowed to drive

him from one curacy after another until Caswell at last faces his task alone, there is abundant evidence that through such stern discipline he finally receives his exceeding great reward.

It is a notable feature of *Caswell* that it tolerates no half measures in dealing with a sin-stained soul. The momentous struggle is recorded with great fulness, of which we will give the reader some condensed illustrations:—

'The barrier that divides the visible from the invisible slowly disappeared, and the two were mingled into one. . . . All around him and within him a mighty spiritual force was working. The sound of chanting was wafted through the open door, and as distinctly to his spiritual senses came the measured cadence of the Divine footfalls echoing through the universe. . . . Slowly the silent Vision dissolved into an infinite and all-pervading essence of overpowering beauty and love. Could this be the unveiled Vision of God? For an instant he was lost in ineffable joy. Then his thoughts turned back upon himself. Down from the heights of spiritual rapture, where for an instant he had been folded in the arms of the Eternal Love, he was thrown back upon his own utter foulness. Never before had he felt himself so loathsome, not even when he first shrank in terror from the unveiled presence of the Divine Purity. For now he had felt the Divine Love; he had seen the beatific Vision; he had been granted one brief glimpse into the infinity of bliss from which his sin had snatched him. Never again could the thought of God bring terror. All terror was swallowed up in the wild regret, in the infinite yearning after the impossible, the consuming hunger that could only be satisfied with the unattainable, with God Himself.

\* \* \* \* \*

'Did he see the priest once more, standing high on the altar steps, with uplifted right arm? No, this was no earthly priest. It was One in Whose face shone high majesty and kingly love, the perfection of divine and human beauty. . . . He flung himself down before Him and tried to kiss his feet. But in vain. The weight of his own villainess held him back. Surely the pitiful eyes were looking down upon him tenderly. Yes, but with a tender reproach. Was the uplifted arm raised to strike or to bless? Neither; but to show the print of the nail. The agony of regret and yearning vanished. He lost all thought of self. Nothing filled his heart but the vision of the wounded Christ, and he shrank under it as under a terrible weight. Down again into the outer darkness he sank, but not into sin, not into despair, for out of the depths he looked up at the face of Christ, and for the moment was content. The weight of the love of Christ had crushed him into hopelessness, but it had also for the time crushed out all thought of self' (vol. ii. pp. 30-2).

When he had left the church, and regained the road, Caswell presently, worn out as he was with emotion and fatigue, lay down, as he thought, to die, when a voice sounded in his ears: 'My son, are you sick?' Caswell opened his eyes and

saw  
pries  
of th

I

to a

of su

tion

and

admi

them

their

not a

agoni

with

shoul

thing

bitter

no or

solem

A ye

the si

this t

true

banis

reade

page.

unflin

which

repair

hatred

ing.

by a

follow

T

old pr

and y

beaut

or in

work

humil

immor

'but t

it. A

which

saw bending over him an old man in the dress of a village priest. 'I am sick unto death, and my sickness is a sickness of the soul.'

It is difficult to apply any satisfactory canon of criticism to a description which details individual experience in a case of such exceptional intensity. We are not sure that the position is one which legitimately allows of minute delineation, and that feelings such as those which we have portrayed admit of being so fully elaborated. It were easy to turn from them with contemptuous expression of distaste or disbelief in their reality. It were more rational to ask whether there be not a Holy of holies for even the most sinful soul under the agonies of conviction, into which it is sacrilegious to penetrate with curious gaze. The sublime reticence of Holy Scripture should perhaps be imitated in handling those most inward things of which they declare 'the heart knoweth its own bitterness.' But whatever our opinion may be on this point, no one can question that the author has treated these deep solemnities in a reverent spirit and with a masterly touch. A yet stronger and kindred objection may be brought against the shocking realism of Delilah's death-bed.<sup>1</sup> We consider this the principal blemish of the story. It was not without true insight into the principles of art that Greek tragedy banished scenes of actual violence from the stage, and the reader would gladly have been spared so terribly repulsive a page. No doubt the author's purpose was to follow up with unflinching pursuit the far-reaching and deadly effects of sin, which even the deepest penitence may be utterly impotent to repair; but the picture of the lost woman with shrieks of hatred and blasphemy on her dying lips is gratuitously revolting. The author could surely have enforced the tragic lesson by a less nauseous, but not less effective, method. Let us follow a little further the current of the story.

The chapter which describes Caswell's long illness in the old priest's house, and his treatment by the simple-hearted and yet spiritually wise and loving pastor, is of remarkable beauty, power, and truth. There could hardly be a nobler, or in some ways a more difficult conception adequately to work out, than that of the old man labouring 'with shrinking humility, and yet with grateful exultation, for the rescue of an immortal soul.' The strain was terrible, almost intolerable: 'but the work had been laid on him by God, and he must do it. And every morning there was the mass to be offered, in which his failing human nature would absorb strength from

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 178.

contact with the triumphant humanity of Christ.' With great fullness of detail, and yet with such complete mastery of his idea as to preserve the author from extravagance and unreality, the mental experience of the sin-sick and wasted patient, and of his startled yet tender physician are unfolded: the one 'overstrained by alternations of metaphysical subtleties, wild bursts of passion, unutterable weariness of cynicism, and mystic ecstasies of woe and bliss;' the other, accustomed only to the simple difficulties of his peasant sons and daughters, yet, through constant and humble communion with God, rich in heavenly wisdom. No wonder that a warm affection sprung up between them, and that the younger man, despite his store of knowledge and the force of his strong and disciplined intellect, looked up with reverence to his unlearned guide. But it is not as yet that we have reached the full depth and pathos of the author's teaching. Caswell has surrendered himself entirely to a life of simple restfulness—'communion with God and penitential sorrow his one desire;' but the old priest divines that to preserve him from unwholesome and presumptuous mysticism he must send his disciple into the world to go out and do active battle against evil, and he urges that his first duty is to seek out Delilah Rayner and try to lead her to repentance. Here comes in the strongest temptation to resistance, and the fiercest mental struggle. Not long before the events which had led to his conversion Caswell had made the acquaintance of Lilian Blackwell, a sweet English girl. A brief intercourse had purified and ennobled him beyond his wildest hopes, and it had been accidentally revealed to him that his passionate admiration was returned. Yet the very intensity of his love caused him to shrink back. Better any suffering and relapse than that Lilian's pure soul should be stained by contact with his. But he did not feel so far from her now. Some of his deepest stains were washed away, and the vision of their closer intimacy was exceeding precious; it soothed his vexed mind and drove out unpleasant thoughts. And now the helpful companionship of the old priest, the hallowing vision of the pure maiden, both must be renounced.

'He dropped his hands with a gesture of despair. Delilah Rayner thrust in upon his mental vision while his heart was full of the remembrance of Lilian! The very possibility of coupling the two names together was more than he could bear. And his friend was telling him that Delilah had a claim upon him, nay more, that God had a claim upon him through Delilah, which he must not renounce while they both lived. Then, if so, farewell to those sweet thoughts of Lilian which had led him nearer to the Divine purity, and through



which God had checked his course when he seemed at the lowest depth of vicious cynicism. If his mind was to be full of Delilah, the slightest recollection of Lilian must be avoided, for it was a profanation even to think of them together. So were the sweet visions ruthlessly destroyed in the first moment of their revival' (vol. ii. p. 57).

At first he passionately refuses. Presently there comes before his mind a verse from the *Miserere*: 'Docebo iniquos vias tuas: et impii ad te convertentur.' Teach God's ways to the wicked! Whom could that mean but Delilah? It is the requirement of boundless love, and he yields, without hope or brightness. 'There is only in his face the steadfast calm of patient repression of pain.'

There is a certain affectation and unreality about the *New Antigone* which places it in striking contrast with *Caswell*. The ability of the writer so far surpasses any other quality which this romance displays, that our first thought on reading it is not 'how natural,' but 'how clever.' There is none of the perfection of art which conceals art; for the elaboration of finish is palpable on every page. There is none of the creative power which breathes life into the *dramatis personæ*, and which makes us forget, as they speak and act, that they are but shadows projected by the imagination of the author. There is none of the distinct vision and warm sympathy which inspire the characters and carry away the readers. The majority of the men and women move before us with aristocratic dignity that is a little stilted, and artistic culture that narrowly escapes being priggish. Lady May, Lord Trelingham, Rupert Glanville, who fill so large a part of the narrative, fail to excite more than a languid interest in their destinies. Except in Hippolyta, the heroine, and Ivor Mardol, the one touch of nature that makes us all akin is only discernible in the subordinate characters. The interest of the story centres round the subjects which are discussed in its recital; not on the men and women (Hippolyta and Ivor again excepted) in whom it is embodied. Given as a thesis the danger of communistic theories, especially in their bearing upon marriage, and direct that the discussion shall be thrown into the form of a romance, this would adequately represent the genesis of the *New Antigone*.

It is not inconsistent with such deficiencies as we have noted that the *New Antigone* should contain many passages of exquisite description of scenery, much discussion finely expressed, and evincing great subtlety of discrimination about art, as well as keen dissection of the fallacies which underlie

the theory of Nihilism. Yet even in some of these aspects the author's forte is also his foible, and the reader wearies of the landscape word-painting with which the *New Antigone* is profusely adorned. It is a more serious blemish that much of the writing is so overstrained and unreal as to be utterly improbable. Take for example the chapter entitled 'Anarchy in Purple,' in which Rupert is introduced to 'the Athenians,' a section of the Socialist community—recollect that the scene is the neighbourhood of London, and the leading actor an English duke. The place of meeting of these aristocratic communists is of course in halls of Oriental splendour, decoration perfect, *cuisine* sybaritic, Nubian page of exquisite beauty, fragrant nargileh, paintings, statuary, curious furniture *ad libitum*. Here is a condensed fragment of the Duke's portrait as drawn by one of the company :—

'The history of the Duke of Adullam would be frightfully strange in your ears *were you told merely what I know*. . . . But you have only to look at him [he had already been described—well-proportioned, six feet high, motions graceful as a panther's, large dark eyes flaming like a basilisk's, melancholy passionate mouth], and you can imagine what kind of secrets have made up his life and taken the glamour from it. . . . Consider his fascination, grace, and accomplishments. They would make him miserable in any station, high or low. . . . He has drained the goblet of pleasure, and for him the intoxication is past. He cannot be deluded any more. . . . The Duke, for his misfortune, is neither a fool nor a poet. He is clear-headed, self-controlled, accustomed to the childlike devices of men who come to him enamoured of his influence, and of women that have fallen under the spell of his enchantments. . . . *I do not say he cannot love, but he cannot believe in love*, and hardly in friendship. He is *therefore* very exquisite—and very corrupt. . . . His most dreadful quality is to be invulnerable. He has got tired of men and their worship, and has leaped down from the altar and begun demolishing the temple' (vol. iii. pp. 148-50).

Here is a fragment of the Duke's portrait drawn by his own hand on the same occasion :—

'What would I not give for the despair, the active, poignant despair, no mere dull and chronic feeling, which I underwent in the days of my first abandonment—not where I forsook, that would have been tame—but where I was forsaken? The throbbing of exquisite pain, the life in all its fiery ebullition, the changing dread and sudden palpitations of joy as the heavens above me closed or opened !' (*ibid.* p. 155).

There may be those who consider this description powerful; to us it appears absurdly overdrawn, and not a little inconsistent. The man who is so devoured with ennui that he would envy the eels the pleasure of being skinned alive is full

of energy, and carries on an immense correspondence, much of it in cypher. The conception is contradictory and absurd. *Res age, tutus eris.*

There is no better test of an author's real strength, and of the taste which is one of its most important elements, than the way in which he handles the passion of love. No doubt love, conventionally, often breaks out in fantastic speech and eccentric action; but at least a certain method is required in its madness, and the topic is one in which the boundary line between the sublime and the ridiculous is perilously thin and needs to be jealously guarded. We say nothing for the present of Hippolyta's ardent affection for Rupert Glanville, her whole training from her birth had been so unique as to warrant exceptional manifestation; but the case is very different with Rupert Glanville and Lady May. They have both of them reached an age when the judgment is fairly matured, and they are not likely to be betrayed like children into unreasoning absurdities. Lady May is a peer's daughter. Head of her father's establishment, with cultured, well-balanced mind, able to hold her own high place in the world, she can accurately estimate the worth of worldly position, and has many worthy suitors, lords of broad acres, at her feet. But she has day dreams of her own; 'she will only unite her life to another which is governed by the highest thoughts.' Possessed by this lofty ideal, Lady May is wandering idly through a huge picture gallery, when she is 'struck one day with a drawing of extraordinary breadth of power and splendid execution.' It is a picture of the Lady of the Mere, a figure radiant with life and longing, full of an intense desire which sought and could not attain its object. Henceforth '*animum pictura pascit inani.*'

'The picture was her book of Hours, her philosophy for many a day. *She lived in it*; she saw its every detail, and could have drawn it from memory. As soon as her mind would let her she begged Lord Trelingham to purchase the drawing; but it had made a great impression and was already sold.'

On the next page we read: 'She came unexpectedly on a small picture (by the same hand) in a friend's drawing-room, and acknowledged, *by the violence of her emotion*, that she was falling in love with the unknown artist' (vol. i. pp. 153-5).

There may be young ladies of twenty-five who fall in love with an unknown man because he has drawn a girl with wondrous eyes gazing out into a boundless sky, behind 'whose wan clouds the sun is shining, *eclipsed only by them*;' but they certainly are exceptional and we inquire with eager curiosity

what manner of artist this may be. The answer is utterly bewildering. On one page we learn that Lady May read in the picture a kind of irony, bitter and sad, which she sums up in the phrase, Unsatisfied Ideals. On the very next we are told what Glanville painted was full of life, life running *over at the brim*, energetic, bold, adventurous; nay, more, 'he was free, ironical, and, as the critics said sometimes, joyously pagan.' The unsatisfied soul running over at the brim or in any other direction is quite beyond us. Let us turn to the artist himself, whose vocation it is to give beauty its clear expression, and learn what is the temper of his passion. Here is the reply: 'He could not love as the common man loves; the passion he felt was individual, characteristic; it glowed with another fire than that which draws man and woman to have one heart in two bodies, for it aimed at a union of soul with soul, of all that was best in him with all that he imagined in Hippolyta.' A more rapid empty phrase never was penned. Was true love ever known, could it possibly exist, without taking its quality from the soil out of which it springs? Is it not equally true of the rude peasant as it is of the high-souled artist, that his love is individual, characteristic? So far we have only a definition of the individual by that which is common to the whole genus. But there is yet worse to come; what escapes us in direct description the reader may learn by means of comparison, and to this end we have one abstraction instead of another; not one heart in two bodies (whatever that may mean), but a union of soul with soul. Thus by aid of a distinction without a difference the picture is complete.

These blemishes are more serious than they appear at first sight in a story whose purpose is to enforce an important moral lesson. They indicate a craving for and a pandering to pernicious stimulus, instead of aiming at the chaste and thoughtful style which alone suits a serious subject. They betray a lack of intellectual and moral discipline. They beget in us a distrust of a writer who can fling about his words so loosely. We begin to ask ourselves is he competent to handle the theme which fills one half his pages. Are his conceptions of the true dignity of woman and of the relations which not only should—but, thank God! do—exist in England between the sexes just and true? Lady May falling in love with a man she has never seen, beguiling her father to invite him to Trelingham, letting him see plainly enough—though not immodestly—that he has won her heart; dangled, slighted, and finally wedded to the wreck of her coy and (to her) cold-blooded idol. The Countess Karina unblushingly pursuing

188  
the  
lyt  
hu  
in  
ass  
are  
is  
bro  
tial  
cre  
som  
Lon  
sive  
Ang  
the  
min  
amp  
and  
prie  
cler  
tact  
the p  
she c  
clear  
site.  
which  
lousl  
was t  
(vol.  
V  
been  
She  
of so  
throu  
assoc  
to Co  
passi  
give  
to tal  
of the  
never  
devot  
Rupe

the honest but utterly irresponsible Tom Davenant. Hippolyta flinging herself at the feet of Rupert. Annie Dauris hunting Maurice Regan. These are all the female characters in the *New Antigone* and they suggest grave misgivings.

As we search deeper beneath the surface we are not reassured. Truth in substance, truth in tone, truth in detail—are any of these apparent save where the Roman communion is concerned? Throughout *Caswell* we are conscious of a broad, genuine, loving sympathy which can recognize Christian effort in those who hold the Calvinist, Catholic, or Roman creed. In the *New Antigone* we are ever and again met by some witless sneer at English Churchmen, lay and clerical. Lord Trelingham serves mainly, Lord Hallamshire exclusively, as a butt for the author's scorn of Anglican ritual and Anglican missions. Lord Trelingham's ideal is nothing but the digging up of old grave-clothes and multiplication of *minutiae*; it is insular, parochial, sectarian. The book bears ample internal evidence that its author is a Roman Catholic, and, with the superb assumption so characteristic of the Roman priest of this nineteenth century, the only sketch of a London clergyman is drawn as follows:—

'It seemed to Hippolyta that she had come unexpectedly in contact with a Pharisee; and although she had heard of his kindness to the poor, and knew that he spent much of his time in visiting them, she could not help fancying that he looked on himself as exceedingly clean, and on those to whom he stooped as exceedingly the opposite. With scornful amusement she pictured the surprise and disgust which would have taken hold of this handsome, clean-shaven, scrupulously fitted-up ecclesiastic, had he learned what manner of woman it was that came to plead the cause of Annie Dauris within his gates' (vol. iii. p. 31).

We are constrained to hurry on to the crisis. Hippolyta has been educated by her father exclusively in the principles of '89. She is brought up to abhor Christianity and the institutions of society and to look forward to the regeneration of mankind through communistic revolution. Living in isolated seclusion, associating only with the Nihilists who pay hurried visits to Colonel Valence, she returns Rupert Glanville's love with passionate intensity, and only awaits her father's consent to give herself to him. Colonel Valence has started for Russia to take part in the plot which culminates in the assassination of the Czar, and has left her a letter to say that probably he never will return. What is she to do? She believes that self-devotion is the gospel of woman. She determines to join Rupert, and, without notice of her intention, he finds her

one evening, to his unfeigned rapture and bewilderment, on returning to his studio :—

"There was silence in the room. They could neither of them speak or move in the flood of happiness which came over them. Hippolyta was the first to release herself and go back to her former attitude by the fire. She waited for him to take up the conversation.

"Then," said Rupert with a pleasant laugh, sinking back into the chair by the easel, "I must get a special licence as early as I can—to-morrow morning, if possible."

"Hippolyta gave him a curious, smiling look. "Who grants you the special licence?" she asked.

"I don't know, I am sure," he answered. "I am not learned in these things. I fancy it is the Archbishop of Canterbury."

"Do you believe in the Archbishop of Canterbury?" she inquired, still smiling.

"He, too, smiled at the question on her lips at such a time. "Not a great deal," he said. "But he is an institution, a piece of antiquity. And we cannot be married without him."

"Can we not?" she said. "What a strange thing that would be! No, Rupert, we do not want the Archbishop's licence, or anyone else's." The words sounded strangely on her lover's ear.

"You are excited, Hippolyta," he said, "and it makes you talk in a fanciful way. I care nothing for the licence. We can be married by banns, in the old fashion, if you like; but it will take more time, and you will have to be called by Mr. Truscombe in Trelingham Church."

"Not in any church," was her firm reply. "Listen, Rupert, I see you do not understand me yet. I love you with my whole heart, but I have not ceased to be Hippolyta Valence. Do you know how I have been brought up? I am not a Christian; I have no religion, except to follow my conscience; to live the highest life, and help towards realising the noblest ideas. My father has taught me that all religions debase them. And do you imagine that it would become my father's daughter, at the very moment he is staking his life in the battle for the future, to stand at a Christian altar, and submit to institutions which he and I have renounced? I will never do such a thing."

"But, my dear, dear Hippolyta," he cried in amazement, "it is only a ceremony. It can do you no harm."

"Yes, it can do me this harm—that I shall be acting a falsehood. I have neither regard for the Christian ceremonies, nor belief in the creed which they express."

"But surely you believe in the sacredness of wedlock?"

"I believe in the sacredness of love; but I will have no priest to utter his superstitious formulas over my head, or recite legends to which I must hearken while despising them, or pretend that you and I may not consecrate our hearts to one another without his leave. Nor will I submit to any civil ordinance. To bind myself before man would be more foolish even than to take an oath in the presence

of a  
really  
we n  
natu  
chan  
alleg

wild  
suici  
tract  
incom  
Som  
enfor  
daug  
Regn  
he n  
back  
Over  
not s  
when  
will h

W  
and s  
that  
We r  
novel  
purity  
of Hi  
it thro  
and t  
sin th  
mine.  
source  
There  
broad  
health

Ro  
dispro  
Christ  
réchauf  
long b  
ture o  
much  
easily



of a God I do not believe in. Why should you care, Rupert? You really think as I do; and yet you are the slave of old customs. Are we not alone in the world, simply given into each other's hands by nature and destiny? Can a priest bid you cease to love me, or change our feelings? Here is the marriage of true minds. Can he allege an impediment against it?" (vol. ii. pp. 141-3).

It is but just to Rupert to say that he yields to this wild appeal only after Hippolyta has threatened to commit suicide in case of his refusal; and after a whole night of distracted agony, which is very powerfully described, with curious inconsistency Hippolyta assumes the name of Mrs. Malcolm. Some time passes in unbroken happiness, but during Rupert's enforced absence she visits some poor neighbours whose daughter is entangled in a questionable *liaison* with Maurice Regner, a man of much higher rank than her own. 'But will he marry you?' is Hippolyta's question. The arrow flies back to her own heart. The sin of her position is revealed. Overwhelmed with shame and sorrow she disappears and is not seen again until after Rupert's marriage to Lady May, when she is wearing the dress of the order to which her life will be henceforth devoted.

We have passed over whole sections of *The New Antigone*, and some of them are not inferior in force and interest to that portion on which our attention has been concentrated. We regret more keenly its faults because they sadly mar a novel which deals truthfully with the deep question of moral purity. The sin is not condoned as under the special faults of Hippolyta's training a weaker hand might have condoned it through the marriage of Hippolyta and her lover. Stern and true is the key-note she strikes. 'I have poisoned by my sin the bliss of marriage at its source—its joys can never be mine.' So, too, both the intensity of the guilt and the only source of pardon are faithfully brought out before the Cross. There may be expressions to which we might demur; but, broadly stated, *The New Antigone* is a welcome example of healthy treatment of sin.

*Robert Elsmere* has rapidly attained a celebrity altogether disproportionate to its actual importance as an assault upon Christianity. It might at first sight seem strange that a mere *réchauffé*, however daintily served, of objections which have long been familiar to all who are acquainted with the literature of the so-called higher criticism, should have attracted so much attention; but the notoriety of Mrs. Ward's book is easily accounted for. The persistency of the attack upon

what so large a mass of readers deeply reverence, and in which many more feel at least some interest; the high scientific and literary ability of some of those by whom orthodoxy is assailed; the enormous importance of the issues involved; the friction caused by the increased degree in which Christianity intrudes on modern life at the same time that the advancing luxury of our day demands more exclusive devotion to the world; the continued cross-fire of attack and defence kept up in the leading monthly periodicals, and which brings fragments of the question into quarters where they would otherwise be unknown: all these are reasons why the public mind is on the alert for every new phase of an old subject on which the last word has not yet been uttered. Add to this Mrs. Humphry Ward's own literary position; the *esprit de corps*—we had almost written a less complimentary term—which prevails amongst a considerable literary circle, and which is prompt to applaud every onslaught on the Christian faith—and more than all the descent into the arena of so distinguished a champion as Mr. Gladstone—and there is enough and more than enough to explain the influence which Mrs. Humphry Ward's book is said to exercise in disturbing many readers. Let us frankly own it. We regard *Robert Elsmere* as a most dangerous book, as one more likely to unsettle minds that have not hitherto been directed to historical criticism than an elaborate treatise would be; and that, not because we consider the arguments of special power, but because of the attractive form in which they are presented. Thousands of persons who would turn aside from a well-reasoned and coherent chain of thought and criticism will eagerly devour the story of *Robert Elsmere*, and with it the injurious teaching it embodies. Thousands more who would peremptorily reject the same teaching under the guise of fiction if presented in harsher tones, will be lured by the 'sugaresque' sympathy so largely expressed for the weaker minds who cling to Catholic truth. It may seem paradoxical to assert in the same breath that there is no special power where there is special danger. Let us see whether an analysis of the work will justify our judgment.

We confess it appears presumptuous to differ from the expressed opinion of many competent judges, but we ask with all confidence where is the power or the novelty of this attack on Christianity? That Mrs. Humphry Ward has written a brilliant novel is unquestionable. She has grouped her figures on the canvas with masterly skill. She thoroughly understands the proportion and composition of a picture. She has

dra  
of  
vill  
sion  
rec  
aw  
tion  
airy  
fem  
sup  
star  
—a  
nov  
cou  
Rol  
ado  
pen  
by  
stru  
resi  
only  
the  
repl  
the  
A f  
no  
tion  
assa  
with  
deli  
Els  
reve  
thro  
clos  
con  
sion

duc  
elen  
gras  
theo  
defi  
the  
help  
whe

drawn alternately with firm and facile brush such diverse types of womanhood as Catharine and Rose, Madame de Nettemville and Mrs. Darcy. She is equally at home in the seclusion of the lake country and the crowded London *salon*, in the rectory and at the hall. She has power to give life and awaken interest and command sympathy, not only with creations so distinct as the massive, saintly, noble wife and her airy, gifted, artistic sister, but also with the subordinate female actors in the drama. If her men have not the same superabundant life, they only suffer in comparison with the standard she herself supplies. But when all this is admitted—and we do admit it ungrudgingly—where is the force or the novelty of this attack upon orthodox Christianity? There could be no power in the mere assertion that on a given day Robert Elsmere had left the Church of England and had adopted a creed of his own devising; is there anything more penetrating in his compounding one with ingredients furnished by Wellshausen and Renan and Matthew Arnold? The destructive value of a projectile depends upon the nature of the resistance it encounters; it is harmless if so directed that it only cleaves the air until its force is spent. This is exactly the case with *Robert Elsmere*. He has not a word to say in reply to Mr. Wendover. The citadel is carried, not because the fortress is indefensible, but because the defence is craven. A few pages of condensed and well-worn arguments to which no reply is attempted, and a score of brief but broad assumptions of the very points at issue, compose the whole direct assault, and these might be erased bodily from the story without its interest being materially impaired. It is in the delineation of the mental struggle through which Robert Elsmere passed, yet more in the painful shock which the revelation of it caused his wife, and their intense suffering through the partial severance of hearts whose fibres had been closely intertwined, that the passion and pathos of the story consist, and not in the exposition of the reasons which occasioned it.

Nor is the indirect force of the attack any greater. Deducting assumptions presently to be noted, what one added element of spiritual power does Elsmere enjoy through having grasped his new convictions? This ripe scholar and profound theologian, like other modern creed-mongers, has formed a definition of the Divine. 'God,' he tells us, 'is that force at the root of things which is revealed to us whenever a man helps his neighbour, or a mother denies herself for her child; whenever a soldier dies without a murmur for his country, or

a sailor puts out in the darkness to rescue the perishing; whenever a workman throws mind and conscience into his work, or a statesman labours not for his own gain but for that of the state.' Once more we ask is there any new power in such a dogma as this? Is not all that is true in it more simply stated in Holy Scripture, and known as the alphabet of Christianity to the veriest babes in Christ? 'Every good gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights.' 'God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.' 'Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth.' Only for those who accept St. John's teaching instead of Mrs. Humphry Ward's, God is not only a force, but a Father.

Wherein, then, it will be asked, lies the secret of that impression of strength which this book has evidently stamped on many minds? We answer that, to our thinking, its whole force consists in its remarkable subtlety. We do not intend any offence. We impute no unworthy motives. But if the intent had been to beguile, the manner of execution could hardly have been more perfect. The unsuspecting reader is led on step by step in such gentle gradations that he is quite insensible of the descent he has accomplished.

The story opens with the Westmoreland home of the Leyburns, and so entire is the sympathy of the writer with Catharine Leyburn, the very soul of orthodoxy, on whose uncompromising faith the least murmur of scepticism jars intolerably, that the strictest Recordite would have no misgiving. Presently the scene shifts to Oxford. Here the indifferentist (though thoroughly sceptical) Langham is so contemptible that the poison of his arrows—which yet may rankle—is disregarded in our scorn for the archer. Next, the noble-hearted Grey, who apparently holds all doctrines in solution, suggests the thought that practical Christianity can exist without any dogmatic basis; which is as true as that a well-built house might stand for a season of fine weather without foundations. Grey had remained a layman because it was impossible to him to accept miracle. But he only quickens Elsmere to religious energy. 'The Tories are always carrying off his honey to their hive.' Then follows, after serious thought and no favourable home influence in that direction—his mother spending much of her superfluous Irish energy in skirmishing with curates; with no pecuniary influence, for his fortune is ample—the decision to take Holy Orders. It is all so smooth and easy. Let us take the next sequence of events. First come the acceptance of Murewell only after a breakdown

through over-work at Oxford; the wooing and wedding, in which spiritual reasons definitely determine the conclusion; then the selection of an historical subject for study leading to the introduction of mediæval, and through that to scriptural, miracle, which are speedily put on the same footing; next follow the truths half admitted, half denied; 'the witness of the time not true, nor in the strict sense, false;' 'the Resurrection partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true;' whilst all is carried on despite Elsmere's will—'he was gathered into one great useless, pitiful defiance'—and still no word records what he urged in reply. In this way the mind of the reader is gradually allured, if by any means he may accept the prearranged conclusion, which even then is sandwiched in between slices from John Bunyan and sprinkled with a seasoning from St. Augustine: 'Every human soul in which the voice of God makes itself felt enjoys equally with Jesus of Nazareth the divine Sonship, and *miracles do not happen*.'<sup>1</sup> Was ever such a lesson taught in such a form before? Nor is this all. Now by innuendo and suggestion, now by broad assertion and bold assumption, the proposed effect is heightened. Take the representation given of the clergy, so plentifully scattered through the book—Newcome, the High Churchman, at once ascetic, mystic, fanatic; Vernon, the Broad Churchman, at heart a sceptic, but holding on to the Establishment lest so valuable a plant should fall wholesale into the hands of the High Churchmen; the *fainéant* East-end rector, doing nothing, yet jealous of others' work—does any living creature acquainted with the actual facts recognize the likeness? Take the recent investigation of the religious condition of South London, so logically pressed in as an argument against the truth of Christian doctrine. Take the supercilious assertion, repeated *usque ad nauseam*, that science and learning and intellect are all antagonistic to Church teaching—and this done with such elaborate sympathy for the inferior well-meaning folk who cannot see it; with pity in which scorn is so delicately veiled: all the forces that, however lovely in themselves, are yet of the weaker type ranged on one side; all the stronger ruling ones, fanaticism alone excepted—embodied in Elsmere, Wendover, Grey, Langham—ranged on the other—it is in the combined effect of all these scattered rays, original and borrowed, fictitious and historical, concentrated into one focus by the skill of a practised *littérateur*, that the power of *Robert Elsmere* lies.

Let us turn for a brief space from the manner to the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 241.

matter of the story. Mrs. Humphry Ward pours scorn upon the great dilemma *aut Deus aut non bonus*. We ask on what grounds does she dismiss it so curtly? She replies dogmatically that Christ was good, but He was not God. We reject His claims, but we revere His character. We answer: His claims are an essential part of His character. The assertion of Divine origin, the claim to exercise Divine power, the stupendous affirmation of Divine pre-existence, are all elements in the moral character of Christ—interwoven into its pattern, inextricably blended with its very being. What does Mrs. Ward know about the Saviour's character save from the Gospels, which she must tear to shreds before she can rid them of the miraculous? How can the reading, as Mr. Wendover advises,<sup>1</sup> of the Gospel of St. John in the light of Jewish pre-Christian, apocalyptic literature touch the record—so simple in itself and so singularly germane to the question raised after eighteen centuries have passed—that the Jews were ready to stone Jesus, 'because He made Himself equal with God'? The subject is too vast and sacred to be disposed of in a page; but what does Robert Elsmere's contention on this head amount to? Surely this. For nineteen centuries a wild delusion has produced the most beneficent effect upon the world, until science born at Berlin, and dandled on the lap of M. Renan, has exploded the long persistent fallacy, and Mrs. Humphry Ward must write a moving tale that shall persuade us of the wonderful discovery. Evolution, which explains everything, has solved the Divinity of the Crucified. The miraculous Birth, the mighty deeds, the Resurrection are all a fiction. 'Miracles do not happen.' The Christ was developed from the carpenter of Nazareth by the study of a fictitious book of Daniel, miscalled, misquoted, misunderstood! A fact so unquestionably scientific has at least one undoubted parallel in English history in the days when Tenterden Steeple was developed into the Goodwin Sands.

'Miracles do not happen.' How crisp, how strong, how simple the great sceptic dogma: but after all is it true? How is it obtained? Through the study, according to Mr. Wendover, '*of the history of ideas*,'<sup>2</sup> with the light cast upon them by the history of human witness in the world. Other people besides Mrs. Humphry Ward, 'aided by mental and physiological science, have studied the conditions physical and mental which govern the greater or lesser correspondence between human witness and the facts it reports' (the reader

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. 247.<sup>2</sup> Vol. ii. 240.



will please observe that the sentence is not ours, but Mr. Wendover's), and have arrived at the conclusion that such study tends rather to confirm miracle than to disprove it. The following extract will show how the matter presents itself to an eminent American writer:—<sup>1</sup>

'The peculiar characteristics of the Old Testament literature make for the credibility of miracle. It discloses the presence and agency of a supernatural power from the beginning. . . . Mr. Spencer says it is impossible for a rude people in the earlier stages of development to receive the ideas of a higher and later civilization. This is exemplified in the slowness and difficulty of training Israel in the knowledge of God, as narrated in the Old Testament. On the other hand, the fact that the higher ideas were present in the minds of some, that they were inculcated in teaching, embodied in laws, organized in ritual and institutions, however imperfectly, prove that the higher knowledge was not the result of natural development, but of supernatural influence. The life of Israel is always gravitating towards idolatry. The literature of Israel is always pointing to the one God, to the moral requirements of His law, and the value of the service of the heart and obedience of the life, above all lip-service and sacrifice. . . . The literature of a people is commonly the outgrowth and revelation of its life. Plainly the literature of Israel is not the outgrowth of its natural life and development. It is the revelation of a light and power above that natural life, educating and directing the people to higher and spiritual ends and ideas. This gives consistency and credibility to the history recorded in the Old Testament. The arguments against its general historical credibility derive their force largely from the foregone conclusion that such supernatural influence, direction and education are impossible.'

We have no space to pursue the subject further. The dogma, 'Miracles do not happen,' is a huge assumption, and if it were true it would effectually cut the ground from under Robert Elsmere's feet. It is based on the erroneous persuasion that nothing can exist which does not come under the scientific law of necessary cause and effect. We unfeignedly rejoice that, with splendid inconsistency, Robert Elsmere retains belief in conscience, in man's power of choice between right and wrong, and in God's persistent guidance and government of the world; but the difficulties which led him to abandon belief in historical Christianity are trifling compared with those which beset the position Mrs. Ward makes him assume.

It would occupy an entire volume to refute all the fallacies which are stated with the calmness of self-evident axioms in *Robert Elsmere*. We must content ourselves with simple

<sup>1</sup> S. Harris, *The Self-Revelation of God*, pp. 490-1.

denial. It is not true, as asserted, that 'man's power of apprehending and recording what he hears and sees has grown from less to more.' It is not true that historical Christianity found ready acceptance when first preached owing to a 'universal preconception in favour of miracles.' No doubt these statements are made in perfect good faith; but the sincere conviction of the writer that these and similar assertions are unanswerable and novel, only prove her want of acquaintance with the literature of the subject, and her incapacity to sound the depths of the problems she so rashly handles. Yet in such propositions as these there is at least an appearance of reasonable probability, which makes them fair subjects for reasonable discussion and inquiry. There are other passages in which the most sacred of all Christian convictions are gratuitously wounded. It is inexplicable that Mrs. Ward should have allowed herself to speak of the Catholic conception of the Atonement as accompanied by 'the *comforting sense of a jugglery* by which the suffering was not real after all, and the sufferer not man but God.'

But one example more. On the question of miracle the Resurrection is, of course, the crucial test, and so St. Paul, as an adverse witness, must at all costs be discredited; and the author rises to the occasion. Mr. Wendover, who is equal to anything—the spirit of evolution incarnate—has written a short but masterly analysis of the mental habits and idiosyncrasies of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Amidst a soothing shower of complimentary epithets he is declared to be 'so weak logically.' Nothing more of a depreciatory nature is said; but we know, like the mysterious 'something which [in the next paragraph] snapped within him,' faith in the Resurrection is lost. Weak logically! What does Mrs. Ward mean? St. Paul makes repeated distinct statements of fact, concluding with 'He was seen by above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. Last of all He was seen of me also.' What has logic to do with it? Is there such a thing as a comforting nescience of jugglery by which a novelist may be self-beguiled?

Yet we are not sure whether *Robert Elsmere* may not do unintentional service to the creed on which it so loftily looks down. We are content to accept Mrs. Humphry Ward's portraits as conclusive evidence of the degree in which character and conduct deteriorate when the divine origin of moral sanctions is undermined. We suppose that men

and women whose lives are guided by the principles of Christianity would appear tame and uninteresting to a certain class of readers; but how much 'sweetness and light' would long survive in society such as gathers in the *salon* of Madame de Netteville? Who shall question the truth of the odious picture drawn by one who is so completely initiated in the mysteries of the naturalistic school—where men who have lost their faith dangle with much gallantry about women who have lost their virtue? The bitterest opponent could hardly have described more vividly the perils which shipwreck of historic faith engenders. True it is that Robert Elsmere rejects with horror the advances of the sorceress, but experience abundantly proves the reality of the connexion between orthodox faith and pure morals, to which Mrs. Ward bears valuable, because unconscious, testimony.

We should wish to urge a further thought suggested by the combination and contrast of the three books we have been considering. Let the reader ponder the condition of a soul weighed down with such a sense of self-abhorrence and defilement as that presented in *Caswell* and *The New Antigone*. Is there any power that can minister to a mind so diseased? In reply, we, too, are content to make our appeal to history. Since the preaching of the Cross of Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, there has been an added spiritual force existing in the world. It has been powerful enough to arrest men in the headlong career of sin, and to turn the whole current of their energies in a diametrically opposite direction. It has acted on the human mind for more than eighteen centuries. It is unparalleled in the history of the world. Its source can be traced with historic certainty to a definite period of time. It has been persistent in its action and uniform in its results. Amidst a thousand varieties of detail, under the infinitely diverse conditions of a St. Paul, a St. Augustine, a St. Bernard, a Luther, a Pascal, a Colonel Gardiner, a General Gordon, down to the latest and lowliest penitent that kneels beside some humble, faithful priest or lay worker in the Church of God, men bowed, crushed, and defiled with the intolerable weight of sin, have for eighteen hundred years found in the Cross not only pardon, but power to lead holy, self-denying lives. On scientific grounds so stupendous an effect requires an adequate cause. Where will you find it? As the effect has been uniform, so the reply of those who have undergone so ineffable a transformation has been unanimous. Through the virtue of the Divine Incarnation we have been made partakers of the Divine Nature, and our changed life we live

through our faith in the Son of God, who loved us, and gave Himself for us. Tell them they are mistaken. Tell them every human soul in which the voice of God makes itself felt enjoys equally with Jesus of Nazareth the Divine Sonship, they will laugh you to scorn. If Mrs. Ward be right, human testimony is worthless, no amount of evidence credible, the whole world a delusion and a lie.

In conclusion we cannot abstain from noticing the indulgent tone in which both Mr. Gladstone and other reviewers have spoken of *Robert Elsmere*. We can thoroughly appreciate and respect the motive which prompted their forbearance. It is the duty of an advocate for Christian truth if possible to allure, not to repel. Yet there is a word which those who write as we do, avowedly from the standpoint of Catholic orthodoxy, must not withhold. It is not to be disguised under honied phrases, nor softened down until the keenness of its edge is destroyed. If Mrs. Humphry Ward selects the vehicle of fiction for assailing the most sacred of all Christian truths; if in her destructive work she expresses a half-contemptuous pity for the faith she once preached and now despises; if she goes to the work of destruction on her knees and wields her battle-axe all the more ruthlessly, it is our part to point out that the point chosen for assault is the corner-stone of all that Christians hold most dear. It is the very test and touchstone of truth and error. 'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God' (1 St. John iv. 2). No doubt Mrs. Humphry Ward has persuaded herself, and would fain persuade her readers, that it is possible to separate that which St. John binds indissolubly together, and that the Christian life can be retained after the Christian creed has been abandoned. We believe this to be the vainest of delusions. Individual sceptics may be, and not unfrequently are, better than their creeds. But the student of history is blind indeed who does not recognize that active love sprang into living power with the distinct recognition of its source, and that for nineteen centuries the one supreme influence which has availed to advance and regenerate mankind has drawn all its vital energy from implicit and adoring faith in the Incarnation of the Divine Son.

---

TH  
theo  
sobri  
been  
as a  
duce  
One  
una  
fesse  
whe  
theo  
belic  
Anc  
havi  
rabl  
agai  
auth  
unw  
and  
duce  
and  
of o  
of p  
ende  
If th  
worl  
lang  
jorit  
odic  
treat  
tion  
of w  
have

## ART. IX.—PROFESSOR HARNACK'S HISTORY OF CHURCH DOCTRINE.

*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* Von Dr. ADOLF HARNACK, Ord. Professor der Kirchengeschichte in Marburg (formerly in Giessen). Band I.: Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas. Band II.: Die Entwicklung des kirchlichen Dogmas, I. (Freiburg i. B., 1886, 1887.)

THE history of opinion in England on the subject of German theological criticism has not been always creditable to our sobriety and soundness of judgment. At one time there has been a tendency, at any rate, in certain circles, to look upon it as almost a new revelation, whilst amongst others it has produced a feeling of panic equally unreasoning and undignified. One writer ascribes to some brilliant and startling theory a unanimous reception which it has obtained only among the professors and students of the somewhat insignificant university where it has arisen, or reproduces the views of a half-fledged theologian with a morbid craving for notoriety, and demands belief for them from all who desire not to be behind the times. Another writer seems to look upon some novel speculation as having no other source but the Author of lies, and as vulnerable, not by the weapons of criticism, which would splinter against such magical armour, but by the potent name of authority alone. Both positions are as untrue as they are unworthy.

It is now perhaps more easy to estimate both the merits and defects of German criticism, and the first feeling it produces must be one of profound admiration. German students and professors are poorly paid, yet they produce an amount of original, solid, unremunerative work, the result often of years of patient industry, compared with which that done by well-endowed Englishmen can cause little but a feeling of shame. If the manuscripts in English libraries have to be collated the work is done by Germans; if the early history of the English language has to be investigated, Germany produces the majority of the workers, and English students find a German periodical the only place where they can publish their more learned treatises. To the self-sacrifice, the self-denial, and the devotion to learning of the Germans we owe a debt, the amount of which it is difficult to estimate. On every subject they have produced works remarkable for erudition, accuracy, and

massiveness. Yet, in spite of their merits, they have many defects. No one has ever accused them of possessing liveliness of style, or grace and clearness of exposition. But many have assumed that works which are so dull must necessarily be true, or they could hardly have come into existence. Yet a capacity for being right is by no means a certain attribute of German investigation. The very thoroughness, the very absorption of energy which distinguish it seem often to take away the faculty of a balanced judgment, and academic rivalry produces an unhealthy demand for novelty of opinion. The number of systems and theories which have arisen and fallen is beginning to make the world hesitate to accept as a gospel the last dictum of criticism, even if it announces that it is infallible.

If we turn to English scholarship we shall find that it has much to be proud of, but also much to learn. The best English work reaches a standard which few Germans ever attain to. Many English books show a power of exposition which almost rivals that of the French. English theologians have a practical aim which often, but not always, reduces the scientific value of their works, but makes them fresh, vigorous, and unacademic. Failure in united enterprise and organization, a want of trained students and specialists, too slight a devotion to scientific progress, too great an inclination to choose popular and remunerative work—these are some of the defects we labour under in England, and in all these points we might learn much from Germany.

At the present time one of the most distinguished theologians of his country, at any rate in English eyes, is Professor Harnack. He has contributed largely to English periodicals, and to the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. His works are conspicuous for vigour and clearness of style; he is something more also than a mere critic, and has philosophic and even practical interests, which add much to the freshness of his writings. Among one class of Englishmen the compliment that he paid to Dr. Hatch's *Bampton Lectures* by translating them has earned its reward; amongst others he has become popular by his vigorous repudiation of the old Tübingen theology. He reciprocates this popularity by reading English theological literature widely, and has perhaps learnt from it some of those characteristics which distinguish him from his fellow-countrymen. He has not probably done any work of such permanent value as the literary criticism for which Professor Lipsius is conspicuous, but he is the most vigorous and striking figure in modern German theology.



It will be convenient, before passing to the consideration of his last work, to investigate his critical methods, in order to discover whether this newest phase of criticism presents any of the conditions of infallibility which have suddenly been discovered to be wanting in its predecessors. 'The hypotheses of the Tübingen school have proved themselves everywhere inadequate, nay erroneous, and are to-day held only by a few scholars';<sup>1</sup> so writes Professor Harnack. Are his own theories and hypotheses likely to be more durable? We shall at present discuss the merits, not of his theories, but of the methods by which he supports them.

The Acts of the Apostles is a book on which much turns, and which many persons have for various reasons found themselves obliged to place in the second century. So far as they have done this not on *à priori* grounds, but in consequence of critical investigation, their arguments must be met, however wrong may be their theory. But if a man desires to be an historian of the Early Church, it is nearly as awkward to be obliged to surrender almost the only authority for the period, as it is to accept one which gives facts not quite in harmony with the theory he holds. To escape from this dilemma it is necessary to ascribe a late date to the redaction of the work, while admitting that early and good materials are to be found embedded in it. Such an hypothesis is necessary in the case of many documents; the real difficulty that arises is how to distinguish what is early and what is late. Here it is that real critical sagacity shows itself, and here accordingly the merits of Professor Harnack become conspicuous. Surely everyone must follow him when he says: 'It is admitted that the first five chapters of the Acts are beset by many critical difficulties. The section, however, consisting of chap. vi. 1 *seq.* is distinguished in various particulars from that which precedes. Every reader who studies the Acts of the Apostles with care will observe that when from reading the first five chapters he passes on to the sixth, he here enters at once on historic ground.'<sup>2</sup> And again: 'Acts xiii. 1. This again is a passage that also bears the marks of a higher credibility.'<sup>3</sup> Surely every reader must feel deficient in a sense of historical criticism if he does not agree to statements which are all the more amusing because they are delivered so dogmatically.

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, vol. 50, 1886, p. 222: 'The Present State of Research in Early Church History,' by Professor Adolf Harnack. Many of the following instances will be quoted from this paper, or from a paper in the *Expositor* for 1887, p. 321, 'On the Origin of the Christian Ministry,' by the same author.

<sup>2</sup> *Expositor*, 1887, p. 324.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 325.

But perhaps some one may ask, What grounds other than subjective are there on which I must accept these statements? Professor Harnack does not tell us, but we will attempt to discover his reason. And it lies in his theory of the Christian ministry. 'We meet with chosen or appointed presbyters,' he writes, 'for the first time in the second century: the oldest witnesses for them are the Epistle of James, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pastoral Epistles.'<sup>1</sup> It is perfectly obvious that the early date of much of the Acts is inconsistent with this view, so he adds in a note: 'I pass over what is said in the Acts of the Apostles about the presbyters of Jerusalem. It seems to me very improbable that the Acts of the Apostles was written during the first century.'<sup>2</sup> Now if we examine the passages to which he ascribes an earlier date—Acts vi. 1 and Acts xiii. 1—we shall find that both of them contain references to phrases which are in accordance with Professor Harnack's view of the origin of the ministry, in the one case to the 'ministry of the Word,' in the other case to the 'prophets' for whom a great affection has recently sprung up. The reason for the acceptance of these passages now becomes clear. All passages which contain any statement inconsistent with the earliest forms of organization are late; and if we ask which is the earliest form of organization, the only answer can be, that which exists in the earliest documents. The advantages of this method of criticism are obvious.

Another instance will show this still more forcibly. Professor Harnack has suddenly discovered that (contrary to what was once the opinion of 'all persons of any critical capacity') 'bishops' and 'presbyters' were not originally different names for the same class of persons. Professor Sanday refuses to accept this conclusion, and quotes, amongst other passages, Tit. i. 5, 7. But what avail such quotations when Professor Harnack can assert: 'Tit. i. 5, 7 I cannot accept as a valid proof, because I believe that i. 7-9 was interpolated into the received text by the redactor.'<sup>3</sup> The immense superiority of assertion over argument becomes obvious: if a statement is supported by proofs, when the proofs are overthrown the statement must go; if it is supported by authority, it lasts as long as the authority is recognized. Professor Harnack has absolutely no grounds for the above statement except the fact that the passage he says is interpolated would conflict with a theory he has formed on insufficient evidence.

Professor Harnack is a very strong Protestant, whose main object is to show that Catholicism owes its origin to the ad-

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor*, 1887, p. 324.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* note 7.    <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 338 note.

mixture which the 'pure spirit of Christianity' received of the superstitions, life, and institutions of the old heathen world. The two were united together by a covenant which conferred on the great Teutonic race the advantages of an introduction to Hellenic culture. Now that we have gained what Catholicism, so interpreted, had to give, we must return, says Professor Harnack, to the New Testament: 'When the covenant had done its work, when the time was accomplished, it was dissolved because the Church in her New Testament possessed scriptures which had nothing to do with the covenant because they were older than it. There lies the abiding value of the New Testament.'<sup>1</sup> This respect for the Bible is very gratifying, but at the same time puzzling. The Acts of the Apostles, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistle of James were all written in the second century, a considerable time after the inroad of Hellenism had begun. They were written after the Epistle of Clement, which breathes, we are told, a very different spirit to the early uncontaminated Christianity. They were certainly not much earlier than the Ignatian Letters and the Apology of Aristides, both, according to Professor Harnack, very Hellenic.

We have seen how necessary it is for us to have a guide possessed of an infallible insight into Christianity to decide in most books of the New Testament what portions are old and what introduced by the redactor. But surely we have the Gospels left. Here, at any rate, is the 'pure spirit of Christianity.' Here we are free from the burden of Hellenism and the corruption of 'Catholicism.' Even if we are to leave out the Gospel of St. John, at any rate there are the Synoptic Gospels left. But alas! no. 'The text of the Canonical Gospels suffered after the middle of the second century some alterations.'<sup>2</sup> 'It is quite evident that in our Canonical Gospels as read to-day not a few of the sayings of our Lord have been preserved for us in various forms in older and more recent recensions.'<sup>3</sup> Again we are disappointed; again we find an infallible critic is necessary to tell us what we are to accept and what to reject. Let us follow his guidance.

Most Christians have been accustomed to consider that at any rate Baptism might be allowed to be an institution of the Founder of Christianity. But now the student of New Testament criticism has to learn that this is incapable of proof. Perhaps he suggests Matt. xxviii. 19. But that, he is told, is no '*Herrnwort*.' At any rate even Renan has selected John iv. 2 as a passage which is undoubtedly and undeniably historical.

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, 1886, p. 238.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 1886, p. 230.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

Quite true; but does not this passage itself say that 'Jesus himself baptized not'?<sup>1</sup> It is not likely that anyone will have the audacity to suggest that the same verse distinctly tells us that His disciples did; against such a method of argument he feels that anything he can adduce will be powerless; while perhaps some of those who are attached to the doctrines and institutions which are branded as Catholic will begin to feel that their position is not without strength if such a mutilation of the accepted Scriptures is necessary for its overthrow.

Perhaps our examination of Professor Harnack's critical method has been sufficiently long; we will pass now to the book that lies before us. The two volumes of the *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* form the most important work he has as yet undertaken. He is now giving the result of the critical labours in which he has long been engaged, and has produced a work which is in many ways very remarkable. The notes overflow with learning, the style is clear, definite, and terse. Professor Harnack has always made up his mind, and no one will have any difficulty in finding out what he thinks. Compared, for example, with a work like Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, the style is pleasantly free from philosophical terminology and involved sentences. It has enabled the writer to gain (what few Germans ever succeed in doing) the ear of the less learned section of English theologians. He is always interesting, has a view upon every subject, even though a wrong one; and anyone who wishes to have his intellect—and perhaps his temper—roused, will find these volumes admirably adapted for the purpose. One defect they have: there is an enormous amount of knowledge collected in the notes—far too much indeed in proportion to the size of the book—yet there is no index of any sort. It is true that one is promised when the second volume is completed, but we are also told that this is not possible for some time. In the meantime the absence of the index will be a great detriment to the usefulness of the book.

The first volume contains the history of the Growth of the Church Dogma (*Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas*), and extends to the outbreak of the Arian controversy; the first part of the second volume begins the history of the Development of the Church Dogma (*Entwicklung des kirchlichen Dogmas*), and embraces the history of theology in the East and the development of the doctrine concerning the person of Christ up to the end of the eighth century. We propose to devote ourselves chiefly to the period treated of in the second volume, but as it is necessary to understand Professor Harnack's

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. p. 56.

starting point, we shall first give some account of the conclusions he arrives at in the first volume.

He begins by describing the materials out of which the Christian faith is to be developed—the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the opinions about Christ held by the infant Christian community, the various forms of belief existing among Jews at the time, whether Palestinian or Hellenist, and the religious and philosophical views of the Græco-Roman world. He then traces the way in which, from a combination of all these elements, the Christian faith has sprung up. An examination of early Christian literature shows how much Christianity was altered and coloured by the previous disposition of each class of converts and each individual new believer. An Hellenist Jew starts with quite a different basis from a Palestinian, and each consequently modifies Christianity differently; most different of all would be the heathen convert, destitute of Old Testament knowledge and training, perhaps a stoic philosopher, attracted only by the intellectual side of Christianity, perhaps an Oriental or Hellenic polytheist who found satisfaction for his half-understood religious aspirations. All these influences acted and reacted on each other, and the result was the development of the Catholic faith as we know it. The first great epoch was the victory over Judaism, the second was the victory over Gnosticism, but both victories modified the character of Christianity. From Gnosticism it learnt the need of a philosophy and a cosmology. From Marcion it learnt the need of a New Testament canon. In opposition to both these it developed the whole mass of ‘apostolic institutions.’ Creeds, organizations, literature, ‘mysteries,’ were all dignified by the fiction of an apostolic origin. The Christian Church became an organized systematized body in opposition to what became afterwards branded as heresy. Then came the great epoch when Christian philosophy was formulated. Philosophers were converted; apologists—often previously well-educated heathen—systematized the faith they defended; the need for an intellectual basis gradually made itself felt, and in Origen Christian philosophy was founded. ‘He became the Father of Church knowledge in the broadest sense of the word, and equally the founder of that theology which was developed in the fourth and fifth centuries and in the sixth disowned its author, yet without losing the stamp which he had given it. Origen erected the Dogma of the Church and laid a basis for science drawn from Judaism and Christianity.’<sup>1</sup>

Such is the main purpose of the volume, and as stated

<sup>1</sup> *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 513.

above it might (with the exception of a few words) be accepted by almost anyone. No one will deny that much of the form in which Christianity is now presented to us was derived from the Hellenic and heathen world, much less that its debt to Judaism was great. But a difference will arise if what has been stated of the form of the Christian religion is ascribed to its matter, and an historical and human explanation is given of some of its accepted doctrines. The Gospel of St. John teaches definitely and clearly the Divinity and Incarnation of the Son. In teaching this the writer uses language which in all probability is derived from Hellenizing Judaism, and ultimately from Greek philosophy. To trace the source of the form used to express the doctrine is a matter of great interest, and can be done by all alike, whatever their opinions. Further than that, it is quite possible to believe that heathen thought, equally with modern philosophy, helped to bring out and develop new sides of Christian truth. But on the question of the origin of these doctrines and truths, the existence of Christianity as ordinarily understood depends.

A single quotation will be sufficient to show the general tendency of Professor Harnack's work.

'The origin of a number of the most important Christian ideas is to us obscure, and will in all probability never be made clear, since there was no one to observe any of the phases of their growth. Although a large number of these ideas may be pointed out in the letters of the Apostle Paul, yet the question whether he found them already existing or independently coined them, must often remain unanswered, and so likewise the further question whether or not it is to the activity of Paul they have really owed their introduction into Christianity. What was the original conception of baptism? Did Paul institute his own independently, and what importance did the latter afterwards possess? When and where did baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost spring up, and how did it penetrate Christianity? In what way, side by side with Paul's teaching, were views on the merits of the death of Christ developed? When and how did the belief in the birth of Jesus from the Virgin prevail in Christianity? Who first separated Christianity from Judaism as the *ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and how did the idea of the *ἐκκλησία* become common? To all these questions and many of equal importance there is no answer. But the greatest problem of all is undoubtedly the Christology, and that not its separate aspects as doctrinally formularized—these can be almost entirely explained historically—but its original starting-point, its proclamation by Paul as the principle of a new life (2 Cor. v. 17), and its recognition by others, as well as him, as the expression of a personal union with Jesus on high (see Rev. ii. iii.).'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 92.



This passage is valuable. In the first place it may be clearly seen that much of what it is customary to regard as an integral portion of Christianity is looked upon as part of its later development, the historical origin of which requires explanation. In the second place, that it is impossible to learn how it arose. *Professor Harnack has, in fact, failed in what he has undertaken.* By the help of an extremely arbitrary critical system, which has been already illustrated, he has succeeded in freeing himself from the views of the mass of Christians. Starting, in fact, with the assumption that they were untrue, he has proved his case by assuming the valuelessness of any document that supports them. He thus attacks the problem he has set for himself free and unfettered by the ordinary restrictions, he has explained to his own satisfaction the origin of part of Christianity; he himself admits that he has failed to explain the remainder. This confession of failure ought to drive a critic back to reconsider his fundamental position, and to re-examine hypotheses which, even if old-fashioned, do not at any rate require the explanation of the inexplicable.

In his first volume Professor Harnack showed how Christian doctrines came into being; in his second he shows how they were developed. In the history of this period there is a mass of material and an absence of important critical problems, so that the scope for critical gymnastic and viewiness is more limited. It is not possible to do more than exaggerate what is in itself correct. There is sufficient evidence to enable a clear impartial history of the four councils to be written, the merits of which all alike would recognize. Professor Harnack has not succeeded in accomplishing what Gibbon only just failed to do. His dogmatic prepossessions are not entirely concealed. He has learnt the use of the term 'Conservative' from Mr. Gwatkin, to express the views of the great middle party in the Arian controversy, and he presses it very unduly—he attacks the Council of Chalcedon as unreasonably as Dörner; the development of the Christian 'mysteries'—*i.e.* sacraments—is offensive to him equally as a Protestant, a philosopher, and a professor. But there is much that is highly suggestive and useful in the ideas with which the book teems; and using his assistance, but not trusting entirely to his guidance, we will attempt to estimate some of the forces which were working during the great Christological controversies.

It has often been the fashion to condemn the doctrinal struggles of the Eastern Church as destitute of any historical

interest. Such a view is essentially erroneous. If rightly viewed they present a lively and animated picture; the question at issue is of the most supreme importance. The highest philosophical knowledge and dialectical skill are exhibited by the leading theologians on both sides: the stage is filled with characters of the most varied position and type. The emperor, the courtesan, the eunuch, and the cook represent the pomp of the world; the courtly prelate, the learned theologian, the wild monk of the desert, the saintly ascetic, the skilled rhetorician jostle one another among the ranks of the clergy. The great figure of Athanasius, dominating a whole world and shaping the doctrines and beliefs of future ages, has become proverbial. The complex interest of the character of Cyril—strong and fierce as a Scotch covenantanter, fighting for the gospel of love with unrestrained and violent zeal, stamping out Hellenism in the world as he has stamped out human weakness in himself—the stern Basil and the gentle Gregory—do these present no attraction? Are not our pity and our wonder alike aroused by the wild Nitrian monks, by a Barsumas or a Shnoodi, willing to give up everything, even their life, for a religion one side only of which they had grasped? And far away at the end of all stands the strange figure of John of Damascus—the theologian who, amidst the enemies of his creed, formulated for future ages the faith of the Church, and summed up the result of eight centuries of doctrinal study and controversy; who gave up a lofty position at a Mohammedan court for the hard and monastic life, and, though the most learned scholar of his age, submitted for three years to the most degrading discipline imposed upon him by a coarse and ignorant monk: a philosopher who possessed an intellect so all-embracing, so sober, so fair, that in the latest attempts that have been made to unite the East and West, his language has been adopted as the basis of conciliation.

At the end of the great persecution, when the Church received from Constantine his fatal gift, her theology was indefinite formally, substantially it was clear and definite. It was imposed on Christians only in the simple baptismal formulas and creeds—the latter dwelling mainly on historical facts and destitute of philosophic phraseology, and differing in different Churches in terms, although not in scope. Many of her teachers, it is true, had used language which after-ages might judge to be unorthodox, interpreted in the light of later problems which would not have been understood. But if we ask, Did the Church, East and West alike, hold clearly to

the essential doctrines of the Divinity and Humanity of Christ? the answer is undoubted. At all times, she herself in her councils or her leading theologians had condemned the heresies which had branched off in every direction. The Ebionites had denied the Divinity and had been condemned; the Docetæ had denied the Humanity and had been condemned; Patripassians, Sabellians, Monarchians had denied each in his own way the distinction of Persons in the Godhead; Paul of Samosata had divided Jesus and the Word—all alike had been condemned. Out of the confusion of the past the Church doctrine began to emerge, more clear, more definite, better understood. But the philosophy which would explain it, and the creeds which would defend and enshrine it, had not yet been formulated. That was the work of the Christian philosophy which had sprung into existence at Alexandria, and of ages of strife and controversy.

The time had come when this step was needed. The recognition of Christianity as a state religion not only involved the confusion of theological issues by the intrigues of imperial politics—it also deluged the Church with a flood of half-believers. Prosperity threatened to do more to injure Christianity than persecution had done. The thirty years of peace which had followed the edict of Gallienus had already shown what would happen when the victory was won. The episcopal office became a worldly prize instead of a post of danger; the rhetorician began to discover that the pulpit afforded an excellent opportunity of using his art. Paul of Samosata was a sign of the danger which was to come; a skilful speaker and a self-indulgent adventurer, he showed heresy in an aspect much worse than it often assumed, and an ecclesiastical pride by no means confined to heretics, while he possessed that combination of rhetorical skill with mental shallowness which has always characterized ephemeral innovators. The problem of Christianity in the face of this inroad of heathen life and morals, of heathen customs and ideas, was highly complicated. From heathen philosophy the Church had gained much in the past, and was still to gain much in the future; it was necessary not to lose its gifts, and yet to avoid becoming its tool. The old Hellenic life contained much which had to be attached to Christianity and passed on to the modern world by this means, but Christianity had to preserve itself from being swamped by heathen superstition. To a certain extent, of course, heathen customs have survived in Christianity, and this in two ways. Either the mere external form of heathenism has survived without anything of its spirit (the fact that

Christmas Day is the old festival of the winter solstice or the birthday of Mithras is one which may interest an antiquarian, but is of no importance: the day is the same—the spirit of the festival has completely changed); or, secondly, unchristian customs and superstitions may have survived under the cloak of Christianity, but forming only excrescences, or preserved in separate localities. It may be true that in the islands of Greece the old worship of Dionysus has become the cult of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, that the old sacred image has become the wonder-working Madonna, or that the statue of Constantine was for the Christian what the statue of Augustus had been for the heathen.<sup>1</sup> These are mere spots on the surface of Christianity, they have not injured its heart. They serve only to show how slow is the process by which faults in a people as in an individual are eradicated, how long a time is required for the education of the world.

The heart of Christianity, we say, was preserved intact. And this was owing to the way in which the attack was met and repelled. It was round the central doctrines of Christianity that the contest which had been transferred from the arena of the amphitheatre to the council and the schools was fought. Christianity found its stronghold in the theology and traditions it had inherited from the past; and one of its surest weapons was the 'asceticism which culminated in monasticism,'<sup>2</sup> and the fervent, deep-seated, spiritual religion which it guarded. The object of the first great fight was to support the Deity of Christ against the assaults of Rationalism—whether the true Deity of the divine Christ as attacked by Arius, or the Deity of the human Jesus as attacked by Nestorius; and always on the side of the religious idea was the army of monks. Athanasius had illustrated and ennobled the ascetic ideal in his *Life of Anthony*,<sup>3</sup> Cyril was defended by a bodyguard from the Nitrian Desert. It is easy, as some have done, to scoff at monasticism, and in the solitude of the study to draw up ideal schemes showing how much better without violence, fanaticism, and bloodshed the world might have progressed; but the student is one whose emotions and passions are under the control of his reason, and he is unable to comprehend the strength of the chains in which old-established ideas and recognized standards of morality or immorality bind mankind.

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, ii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 9.

<sup>3</sup> The genuineness of Athanasius's *Life of Anthony* has recently been proved by Eichhorn, *Athanasii de vita ascetica testimonia collecta* (Halis Saxonium, 1886), a work with which Archdeacon Farrar, in writing his article on St. Anthony (*Contemporary Review*, November 1887), does not seem to have been acquainted.

N  
sel  
ger  
to  
mir  
Lon  
sen  
But  
the  
and  
the  
Hu  
forc

hon  
stre  
in th  
of th  
as a  
in w  
cele  
the  
the  
wate  
educ  
as i  
mon  
man  
mar  
like  
mon  
cann  
char  
he is  
Jesu  
He i  
glad  
mys  
for h  
thing  
of th

1  
lish,  
Amé  
Chris

Not only to elevate before men's eyes an ideal of moral purity, self-sacrifice, and self-denial, however distorted and exaggerated, but also in the loneliness of the desert to teach men to break through the barrier of sense which clogged their minds, and realize the full truth of the Divine nature of the Lord—this was the duty of the monks. Rationalism represents the exaggeration of one virtue, mysticism of its opposite. But Rationalism then had leagued with it the philosophy of the day, and the imperfection of the human intellect; to raise and elevate men against this required all the strength which the unnatural but devoted and absorbed life of the monks gave. Human progress is often a contest between two contending forces, each of which exaggerates one side of the truth.

The character of a monk who in his own country was honoured as a perfect saint will exhibit most clearly the strength and fanaticism which made monasticism such a power in the world. Shnoodi<sup>1</sup> the Copt had developed in the solitude of the shepherd's life a natural tendency to religious zeal. Even as a boy he spent long nights in prayer with his body immersed in water. Even as a boy he was consoled in his privations by celestial visions and honoured for his miraculous gifts, and the frightened countryman saw heavenly lights playing over the hands and head of the saint that were raised above the water. The piety that was nurtured in such conditions and educated by the example of Egyptian asceticism was as fierce as it was intense. 'Gentleness is only the virtue of the moment,' said Shnoodi, 'it is passion which makes a man truly religious; so, said Ezekiel, will you leave your mark on the rock of ages; so the heart of David burned like a fiery furnace.' 'If I come to you,' he writes to the monks, 'with the passion with which God inspires me, you cannot resist me, so terrible is my zeal for God.' But if his character was fierce, his devotion was intense. 'My works,' he is recorded as saying, 'they are not mine, they belong to Jesus. You know Him not. He is my hope and my glory. He is my strength and my honour. He is my joy and my gladness. He is my desire, and His name is the strength of my soul and the life of my heart. He is the hope of Christians, for he is God, the Son of God. It is He who has created all things—things visible and things invisible.' The early years of the life of Shnoodi (he was born about the middle of the

<sup>1</sup> *Shnoodi* seems to be the best representation of this name in English, as 'oo' is the most accurate equivalent to the Coptic 'Oṭ.' M. Amélineau writes *Schnoudi*. The spelling *Senuti*, adopted by the *Dict. Christ. Biog.* vol. iv. (from M. Revillout), is certainly wrong.

fourth century) were devoted to the reform of Egyptian monasticism and the extirpation of idolatry, and in both directions he showed the fierceness of his character. Paul, Anthony, Pachomius, were to the new enthusiast weak and feeble, their rule was lax and easy, their asceticism but light. So he ruled and reformed the monasteries in accordance with his own zeal. Death was a punishment which he inflicted with his own hands for but the slightest breach of the monastic discipline, and death was the punishment to which all who opposed his course in the world were condemned. But though his was the hand which inflicted the blow, he was not responsible for the act: 'Those whom Shnoodi has killed have died,' he said, 'because the end of their life has been reached. God has predestined to visit them at that hour. He is but an instrument of the Divine power. He held in his hand the sword of the Lord, which no one can resist, which obeys God alone. On, on, O sword, to the right and to the left, and over the whole earth: for the world shall be judged by thee.' With the same zeal with which he reformed monasteries Shnoodi attacked idolatry. He ridiculed its absurdities with an eloquence and a power of sarcasm which rivalled the acutest of the apologists. He influenced the passions of the people by appealing to their cupidity, for the idolaters were rich and the Christians were poor. Death was the punishment of idolatry, destruction the doom of the temples. The decrees of the Emperor were powerless, for the people were with him. Rivers could not arrest his course, for miracles were wrought in his favour. The old idolatry was stamped out amid scenes of ruin and violence and outrage.

The end of Shnoodi's life was devoted to the violence of controversy. 'A long battle did I fight with Cyril at Ephesus against Nestorius.' And he fought it, if we are to believe his panegyrist, with blows as well as with words, for he gloried in having publicly struck at and knocked down the arch-heretic Nestorius. At the Council of Ephesus, when the latter was banished into Egypt, a series of misfortunes threw him into the hands of his enemy. A rumour went through the Monophysite world that the Emperor was going to restore Nestorius; Shnoodi visited the prisoner. 'Wilt thou confess that the Virgin was *θεοτόκος*? 'I refused to be persuaded by the bishops at Ephesus and I will not be persuaded by you that a woman could bring forth God?' 'Cease thy blasphemies,' said Shnoodi, and the saint held up his staff. The angel of the Lord struck the heretic, and after three hours of agony he died of a loathsome disease. Shnoodi him-



self was above a hundred years old when he died. He was the firm supporter of Cyril and of his successor Dioscorus. He had been warned in a vision of the terrible result of Chalcedon, and his last years were embittered and his fanaticism was increased by the victory of the enemies of the Lord. His life will illustrate how a devoted Christian might be the murderer of Hypatia and Flavian, and the brawler at the Robber Synod, and how terrible may be the result of an excessive indulgence even in religious zeal.<sup>1</sup>

The time had come when a reaction was needed. Mysticism and unrestrained asceticism exceeded all due bounds. Those ideal aspirations which had supported Athanasius in his period of defeat, but had been controlled by his well-balanced reasoning powers, had already become exaggerated and distorted in Cyril; in Cyril's fanatic successors they passed all limits. The monk who in his zeal to serve God cut himself adrift from all human sympathies, ceased to be human but did not become divine. The devoted mystic who allowed his mind continually to dwell on the glories of the divine Jesus and the mystery of His divine nature, gradually forgot or ignored His humanity. That element of Manichæism which represented the opposing principle to Hellenism, and which always hovers in the background of the early Christian world—which lay at the root of the asceticism of the day, with its degraded ideas of human nature—refused to contaminate the divine by allowing it to become truly human. So the extravagantly orthodox of the Council of Ephesus became the heretics of the Council of Chalcedon; the land which had always been the stronghold of orthodoxy became the home of the Eutychian heresy. Cyril used language which at any rate admitted of a Monophysite interpretation; Cyril's successor was Dioscorus.

<sup>1</sup> On Shnoodi, see Revillout, *Mém. de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1874, ser. i. t. viii. p. 395; *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1883, vol. viii. pp. 401 and 545; Zoega Cat. MS. Coptic Borg.

Since the above was written M. Amélineau, one of the youngest, but one of the most industrious, of Coptic scholars, has published in full a collection of Coptic documents illustrating the history of Egypt in the fifth century, and especially the life of Shnoodi (*Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire*, vol. iv.). In a critical Introduction he throws doubt on many of the conclusions M. Revillout had arrived at, especially the date of the death of Shnoodi. It is very doubtful if he survived the Council of Chalcedon, and was formally a Monophysite. We have not thought it necessary to alter our narrative, as the questions are still under discussion. Moreover, to illustrate the spirit of Egyptian Monophysitism, history as reconstructed by monkish imagination is even more valuable than history as it actually happened.

When mysticism, piety, and religious aspirations had become uncontrolled, rationalizing philosophy began to do its work, and to preserve the balance of the human mind and divine truth. The relation of philosophy to the Church has always been complex. Both Athanasius and Arius might be considered the offspring of Neoplatonism; the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity was couched in the language of Platonic ontology; but the Arian Trinity itself, with its great God at the head, and its subordinate and inferior second God, and its third God still more subordinated, separated by but a narrow line from the world of subordinated beings, was a Platonic Trinity and a reproduction of the Platonic hierarchy of personified ideas. If it was Plato who had inspired the creative element in the development of Christian thought, it was Aristotle who fostered the critical side. The Antiochene school, under the influence of Aristotelian philosophy, developed a critical exegesis and method of Biblical study, and a critical theology, opposed to the mystical and uncritical school of Alexandria. And this Rationalism began to assert itself at the Council of Chalcedon and restored the theological balance of the Church. If Plato helped to create the Christian theology, it was Aristotle who organized and systematized it. Leontius of Byzantium first made his writings a basis for systematic theology, John of Damascus followed in the same paths, and Christian theology, formulated and codified by him, with the aid of Aristotle, was passed from him through Peter the Lombard to the mediæval world.<sup>1</sup>

The Christian doctrine has been accused of being the result of the base intrigues of imperial politics, and to one who resolutely looks only at the details of much of the controversy such a judgment might seem natural, while a close acquaintance with the Byzantine court will not make its odour more pleasing. But to a wider view such a judgment is impossible. The decision of the Council of Nicæa was the result of the free play of the theological ideas of the time; for Constantine—caring little about the result, though caring very much for unity—wisely left to the council a free hand; but its almost complete unanimity may well have been owing to the influence of a sovereign who threw his whole weight on the side which he saw was prevailing. Arius was condemned by an overwhelming majority, but the decision of a council was not sufficient to stamp out opinions which had a natural hold on a large section of the Church. So the reaction was obliged to spread. Arianism survived for fifty years; with the help

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, ii. 383.

of imperial patronage it even attained an unreal supremacy. But it had no basis of truth, and was naturally hostile to Christianity. As long as it was established it continued to exist; orthodoxy was oppressed and persecuted, but orthodoxy increased. As soon as the balance of temporal power swung round, orthodoxy became supreme, and Arianism vanished from the empire as if it had never existed. It had more than a fair chance, but it had no basis of truth. Orthodoxy had a terrible fight with odds against it, but in the end it was completely victorious. Nestorianism was condemned, persecuted, and took refuge in Asia. Beyond the limits of the empire it lived because it was the form of Christianity which was hostile to the empire, and was therefore welcomed by its enemies. Eutychianism had every opportunity. It conquered at the Robber Synod of Ephesus, which, if it had been right, might have been ecumenical. But when Byzantine rulers found that they had made a mistake and were opposed to the majority of their subjects, the Council of Chalcedon gave victory to the other side. This was probably in part the result of imperial influence, but its decision was based on true theology and its gradual acceptance proved its truth. Yet the imperial court was still prepared to change, and if Eutychianism had been able to win the verdict of the majority of the Church, again and again it might have won its way to the front. Why, when the one had what was apparently a universal council in its favour, could it not retain its hold, whilst the other never lost the advantage it gained at Chalcedon? The compromise of Monothelitism seemed to afford an opportunity of union among the Churches of the East. Again the imperial power is opposed to orthodoxy, and again it is obliged to yield. The unity of the Church may have learnt much from the idea and gained something from the practice of imperial power, but it lost more than it gained. The great schism of the ninth century was far more political than religious, and if orthodoxy had not been regarded as inextricably involved with Byzantine despotism, Egypt and Syria might have been less violently heretical. They might still have been won back to the Church and the home of Christianity saved to Christendom.

In the struggles of the great councils it is often possible to see that the personal rivalries of patriarchs and emperors, the dislike felt by Alexandria and Rome for the upstart see of Constantinople, Roman jealousy of imperial interference, imperial desire to conciliate Italy and the West—all alike forwarded or hindered the settlement of important questions.

But in the midst of these rivalries, in spite of occasional falls, the theological and moral position of the see of Rome stands out clearly and definitely. In all the changes and controversies it is the defender of orthodoxy, and an arbiter of the contest. The Roman Church accepted the creed of Nicæa and remained firm to it with all the strength of the old Roman nature. She gave a refuge to Athanasius in exile and never deserted him in his troubles. 'He was aided, he was welcomed at Rome, and was refreshed by communion with our see.' Celestine was Cyril's firm ally against Nestorius; the celebrated Tome of Leo shaped the theology of the whole Church. The importance of her position cannot be over-estimated, though its doctrinal significance has been unduly pressed in the interest of Petrine claims. Of the causes that can be assigned to this faculty of generally being right, that of infallibility must be dismissed, for a single fall makes that impossible, and Rome did fall, and more than once. But the position of theological correctness, which the Roman Church managed to hold, must be accounted for. It was the result of various causes. One was the essential conservatism of the Roman Church. The conservatism of the West was very different from that of the East. It was not a bigoted attachment to a word, or a narrow-minded refusal to recognize the altered condition of the times; it was a wise conservatism which recognized the strength of the Church's tradition, and the weight of the teaching of the past. And so the Church of Rome accepted the decision of Nicæa as expressing in terms which she could never herself have devised that doctrine to which she had held firmly amid many controversies. A second cause was her want of originality. The Church of Rome produced no heretic and no theologian. Destitute of imagination, destitute of creative power, she was never carried away by doctrinal innovations. She received slowly, weighed carefully, and judged solemnly. It is interesting to follow the cautious policy of Celestine in the Nestorian, or of Leo in the Eutychian controversy. Both are slow to form an opinion; both wait carefully until they have listened to all sides. Celestine had been favourably impressed with Nestorius, Leo received most humble expressions of submission from Eutyches, but neither of them allowed himself to be guided by first impressions and to judge in haste. The Church of Rome was generally right because she delivered sentence on the opinions of others like a judge, she did not study doctrines like a theologian. The Tome of Leo is written in clear, well-balanced periods, and its tone is eminently judi-

cial, but its writer has even been suspected of not understanding the controversy he decided, and it is probably true that he approached the subject from without rather than from within, and felt little sympathy with the lines of philosophic thought involved. He succeeds, however, in stating clearly all the issues of the problem, and arrives at a conclusion which avoids all the dangers involved. But, lastly, the Bishop of Rome was able to arrive at a right decision because he was unhampered in his judgment. Away from imperial influence, he was exposed to none of the dangers with which the Patriarch of Constantinople was beset. Free from political embarrassments, judicial, conservative, practical, he was able to steer his bark safely amidst the storms, and to bring to the assistance of the Church a cool head and a firm hand. This reputation as the champion of orthodoxy helped gradually to build up the position he acquired in the Christian world.

Two conclusions seem to be deducible from a survey of the history of the great councils of the Church. The first is, that as the results were obtained by human means, however sacred the subject, the combatants exhibited all the faults of human beings. Violence, intrigue, political ambition, and personal animosity are conspicuous as well as zeal for truth and religious piety. But it is equally true that it was not those unworthy motives which caused the result. Any fair-minded study of the questions involved must undoubtedly show that the final decisions were—granted the premises—right: that if either Nestorius or Eutyches had triumphed, one-half of the great doctrine of the Incarnation would have been lost. The decision and authority of the councils rest on the fact that they summed up and expressed the sense of the Church, and that their decrees have received the sanction of the subsequent acceptance of the Church. But there is a further question which is, perhaps, again opened before us by a motto which Professor Harnack has prefixed to his first volume. Quoting Goethe, he says, 'The Christian religion has nothing to do with philosophy;' and, quoting Marcellus of Ancyra, 'The very name dogma implies human council and opinion;' and he illustrates this from the fact that the term *δόγμα* in Greek is used of the decisions of the senate and the opinions of philosophers. The Christian dogmas are undoubtedly expressed in the language of philosophy, and have been formulated by human minds. Are they, therefore, not binding, and ought they to be dispensed with?

The question really confuses two completely distinct issues.  
VOL. XXVI.—NO. LII.

H H

The one is the truth of the doctrines implied in the creeds and formularies of the Church ; the second is the advisability of retaining that manner of expressing them which has won the assent of some fifteen centuries of Christian history and almost the whole area of Christianity. The first question it is not our purpose to discuss. It is practically the question whether Christianity (as it is commonly understood) is itself true ; and it is perfectly obvious that those who do not believe it will naturally desire to dispense with formulas which preserve it. But, granted that the doctrines are true, their importance cannot be exaggerated, and the belief or disbelief in them cannot be matters of indifference. It is hardly possible to conceive that two persons who differed on them should combine together and act conjointly in religious matters. This age may be quite right in rejecting equally mediæval and protestant scholasticism ; it may be quite right in scoffing at the lengthy formularies of our ancestors, which defined even the most minute points as of faith ; but it is difficult to believe that the spirit of the age is right if it asserts that the Divinity of Christ is a matter of indifference.

Granting, we repeat, that these doctrines are true, and assuming that those who regard them as fundamentals find it on purely practical grounds desirable to decline communion with those who think otherwise, it is difficult to conceive any valid reason against the imposition of such doctrinal formularies as the creeds. Do you agree with the faith they teach ? Then you have no reason against signing them. Do you disagree ? Then you have no right to desire to join a society which is based upon the principles which these creeds imply. Do you think they express badly the doctrines they defend ? On this ground you might demand a hearing, but in that case remember that these formularies represent the result of some six hundred years' contest, and the philosophic ingenuity of the acutest nation of antiquity.

There are two reasons against distinctive formularies which deserve some attention. The first we will state in the words of Cardinal Newman :—

‘ If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the primitive Church, it is not from any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult as in a virtue ; but first because technicality and formalism are in their degree inevitable results of public confessions of faith ; and next because, where confessions do not exist, the mysteries of divine truth, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane and uninstructed,



are kept hidden in the bosom of the Church far more faithfully than is otherwise possible.'<sup>1</sup>

That a danger of formalism and technicality is attendant on the use of fixed words is undoubted: history and experience alike teach this. That the public profession of doctrines may lead to irreverence is equally undoubted. But formularism is not the parent, it is the offspring of unbelief. And the unbelief which repeats a creed helps to carry it on, and the doctrine which it enshrines, to future generations. A religion which is not defended or protected by a formula might be lost by a single generation of unbelievers, or completely transformed by a generation of latitudinarians. Accordingly, the Non-conformist churches are gradually drifting away from the faith, which they only possess as an inheritance from the Church which they have deserted.

A second objection is, that while the doctrines are simple and such that everyone can understand them, the language and creeds which are supposed to explain them are complex and difficult to understand. Here the first statement is incorrect. It is quite true that the doctrines of Christianity are simple in so far as it means that they appeal to every mind, however simple; *but it is not true that they are simple in themselves and easy to comprehend.* A celebrated Nonconformist preacher, when accepting the charge of a chapel, delivered, as was customary, a confession of faith in a speech of considerable length, eloquence, and, we may add, vagueness. He refused to be tied by customary formularies, and stated that he summed up his belief in the one word 'Christ.' Such a confession may be absolutely meaningless or full of the highest meaning; but it is no defence of truth, no statement of doctrine. To those who do not understand it, it needs explanation as much as the Nicene formula; and to those who do, it gives no answer to the first question which every devout inquirer must ask—'What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?'

Professor Harnack, speaking of St. Athanasius, tells us that there are signs that his theology will outlive that of his great Western rival, St. Augustine. If we look around us at the present day this statement will appear in many ways justified. If we look within our own Church, and ask what is that which almost all parties alike agree in preaching, the answer is the Incarnation of Christ. This unites high and low Church, ritualist and evangelical alike. If we look beyond, in our own

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Arians*, I. ii. p. 36 (1883).

country or in America, and ask what is the faith which alone has a hold upon the people, the answer must be the same. There is nothing often more terrible to devout persons than to listen to the harsh and apparently irreverent voice of the Salvationist preacher ; but one point stands out clearly from his preaching. The faith which seizes hold of the masses of the ignorant more clearly than anything else is the faith in Christ. Miserably deformed and little understood though the doctrine may be which that Name implies, though It may often be looked upon as little more than a talisman, yet It is still the one Name which has power to move and to raise the sinful and degraded, and this power it derives from association with the doctrines of Forgiveness, of Redemption, of Union with God, all of which spring from the Incarnation. This is why It is a 'Name which is above every Name.'

In the new reredos which adorns the greatest of our cathedrals this doctrine is represented. The work is in many respects a triumph of the artistic power and skill of the age. With the beams of the sun shining upon them, the two central figures representing the miraculous birth and the glorious death of Him who was at once the Son of God, and man, stand out clearly and distinctly. They represent the most mysterious, the most elevated doctrine of the Christian faith. Rightly understood, they must always repel rather than attract unfitting veneration, for they are images of transcendent ideas, not material representations of superstitions. They are signs of those doctrines which all Christians alike hold, and we hail the conspicuous position given to them in St. Paul's Cathedral as of good omen that the Church of England will remain loyal to those beliefs which unite all Christians however divided and wherever scattered.

---

## ART. X.—TITHE LEGISLATION.

1. *Tithe Commutation Act*, 1836.
2. *Tithe Commutation Amendment Acts*, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1846, 1847, 1860, 1868, 1873, 1878, 1885, 1886.
3. *A Bill to Amend Section 80 of the Tithe Rent-Charge Act*, 1836, 1888.
4. *Tithe Rent-Charge Recovery and Variation Bill*, 1888.
5. *Report of the Committee on Tithe both ordinary and extraordinary. Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury*, 1881. National Society, London.
6. *Second Report of same Committee*, 1883.
7. *Third Report of same Committee*, 1887.

THE pressure of hard times is certain to bring into prominent view grievances, or imaginary grievances, about which men have grumbled in more prosperous days, but about which they have not then bestirred themselves. The agitator and the demagogue are always most successful when men are suffering from the pinch of poverty, and do not know which way to turn in order to relieve themselves. Then arguments are looked upon as sufficient and conclusions accepted, which would be treated very lightly, if not absolutely rejected, by the sounder portions of the community at other times. This has been signally illustrated by the history of the efforts which have been made to alter the laws regulating the collection of tithes.

In 1834 and the following years the price of corn was exceptionally low for those times; the average price of wheat in 1834 being 46s. 2d., and in the following year 39s. 4d., barley and oats selling at proportionate rates; and in 1836 the amount of agricultural distress was so great that a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into and report upon it. This gave the needed opportunity to raise the question of the payment of tithes, and to the introduction and passing of the bill which since that time, with subsequent amendments, has regulated the mode in which the extent of liability to tithe has been determined, and the measures by which its collection has been enforced.

Previous to the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836 tithes generally were liable to be levied in kind; but this was found so inconvenient, so wasteful, as well as irritating, that arrange-

ments were not infrequently made for what practically amounted to a commutation. In many instances from remote times a money payment was substituted for tithes in kind. These payments were called a *modus*, and when a permanent arrangement was made at a time when the value of money was much greater than it is at present, the charge upon land is very trifling. These permanent arrangements, called compositions real, have legal efficacy, and so make the land practically exempt from tithe; in other cases the amount of payment was regulated from time to time by voluntary agreement. In some parishes private Acts of Parliament were obtained for the commutation of the tithe leviable within them, and we believe that in these cases the term on which the average price is to be reckoned is generally twenty-one years, and in some instances the rate is fixed at the end of each period of twenty-one years, and remains stationary for the next twenty-one years.

At a time when agricultural distress was severely felt, and when more expensive methods of husbandry were being much insisted upon, it can be easily understood that an outcry could readily be raised against the payment of tithes. The plausible, but not true, objection would be urged that it was intended for tithes to be levied upon the natural product of the soil, and not upon the capital required to make it fruitful; whilst it would be added with more truth that if the clergy were to be benefited to the extent of a tenth by the outlay and enterprise of those engaged in farming, an obstacle which many would feel to be serious would be placed in the way of improvement. Besides this, the relations of the clergy and of members of their flock were often so embittered by disputes about tithes, that it was thought by many earnest churchmen to be most desirable for the spiritual interests of the people that the collection of tithe should be placed upon a different footing, and one which it was hoped might prevent all collision for the future.

Previous to the passing of the Act of 1836, the clerical owners of tithes had been, generally speaking, most forbearing in the collection of their dues.<sup>1</sup> Lord John Russell, in speaking in favour of the bill which he had introduced in that year, estimated the amount received by the tithe-owner at not more than 60*l.* to 75*l.* for every 100*l.* to which he was entitled; and in some large parishes, where population had greatly increased, and a number of district churches been erected, the amount received by the rector or vicar of the mother parish fell

<sup>1</sup> *Report on Tithe*, 1881, p. 4.

fa  
Ch  
fro  
val  
tim  
lor  
me  
the  
mil  
the  
tur  
are

nal  
the  
gra  
&c.  
levi  
mil

valu  
tion  
sale  
kin  
seve  
sha  
so a  
cha  
tith  
bee  
tith  
in s  
Chu  
tens  
amo  
resi  
and  
mar  
exte  
clau  
mon  
dim  
aver

far short of that sum. We believe that by this commutation the Church lost about two-fifths (40 per cent.) of her inheritance from tithe, and, moreover, forfeited the chance of such additional value as might naturally be expected to accrue in the course of time. Mr. Brodrick, in *English Land and English Landlords*, tells us that 'Mr. Caird estimates that but for this measure, aggravated by changes in the mode of assessment, the annual income of the Church would now have been two millions greater than it is, and that he points out that, under the operation of a law intended simply to encourage agricultural improvement, the community represented by the Church are gradually losing a portion of their natural inheritance.'<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, it has to be remembered that tithes were originally levied much more extensively than upon the fruits of the field.<sup>2</sup> Besides the produce of the ground, as corn, grass, fruit: the increase and produce of animals, fowls, bees, &c., were liable to tithe, and until 1836 such tithes were levied, and personal tithes were also paid out of the profits of mills, fisheries, minerals, &c.

By the Act of 1836 it was ordered that 'the clear average value of the tithes of each parish (after making all just deductions on account of the expenses of collecting, preparing for sale, and marketing, where such tithes have been taken in kind) should be ascertained according to the average of the seven years preceding Christmas 1835,' and the Commissioners shall award the average annual value of the said seven years so ascertained as the sum to be taken for calculating the rent-charge to be paid as a permanent commutation of the said tithes. It therefore followed that, where an incumbent had been lax during the preceding seven years in collecting the tithes due to him, the benefice would be permanently the loser; in several instances which have come to our knowledge the Church suffered seriously in consequence. In one very extensive parish the tithes which ought to have been collected amounted to several thousands a year, but the wealthy non-resident rector had not collected more than as many hundreds, and consequently through his neglect the benefice was permanently impoverished; though not necessarily to the full extent of what the rector had failed to collect, as the 38th clause of the Act authorized the Commissioners within one month of the notice to make the final award, and increase or diminish the amount by not more than one-fifth part of the average, if it can be satisfactorily shown to them that such

<sup>1</sup> *Report on Tithe*, 1881, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 1.

average value as ascertained in the manner already described does not fairly represent the sum which ought to be awarded.

The Act empowered the owners of land to assign land to the extent of not more than twenty acres to the incumbent in lieu of the whole or a portion of the sum to be paid for tithe, provided it was done before the apportionment was sealed. And it directed that the average price paid for British wheat, barley, and oats during the seven years last preceding should be taken, and that 'every rent-charge charged upon any lands shall be of the value of such number of imperial bushels . . . of wheat, barley, and oats as the same would have purchased at the prices ascertained [by the Controller of Corn Returns] in case one third part of such rent-charge had been invested in the purchase of wheat, one third part thereof in the purchase of barley, and the remaining third part thereof in the purchase of oats.' No account was to be taken of the other articles of agricultural produce which had previously contributed their quota to the support of the clergyman, and as the price of these has considerably risen since 1836, whilst that of corn has fallen, the endowment of the Church has suffered thereby. The Act also made provision for levying extraordinary tithe on hops, fruit-garden produce, and coppice wood, according to their annual value during the seven preceding years, and made provision that when land ceased to be cultivated for hops the extraordinary tithe should cease, and that when land shall be converted into hop grounds or market gardens it shall be subject to the payment of the extraordinary tithe at the rate payable in that district, no such payment being made during the first year after the change, and only half during the second year. It also directed how the tithe was to be levied on coppice woods.

By the end of 1880 the sums awarded under this Act amounted to 4,053,961*l.*, of which 2,412,684*l.* went to the maintenance of the clergy; 678,987*l.* to clerical appropriators such as bishops, deans, and chapters of cathedrals, and others; whilst 962,289*l.* were in lay hands, being divided between private persons, who were entitled to receive 766,233*l.*, and schools, colleges, and hospitals, which were endowed with 196,086*l.* per annum from this source.<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen from the long list of amendment Acts placed at the head of this article, that in dealing with this subject, which was then novel, a great number of emendations and alterations were needed, as might naturally have been expected. But it is instructive to mark the varying tone of these

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Convocation*, 1881, p. 3.

amer  
supp  
that  
tithe  
origi  
a fee  
sessi  
jealo  
Gra  
limit  
prev  
be e  
of th  
inter  
the e  
agre  
tithe  
sion  
to b  
ties  
the  
doul  
land  
chan  
mer  
nam  
Com  
a de  
all  
the  
agre  
or s  
tithe  
a fix  
such  
land  
any  
occu  
land  
long  
farm  
prov  
right  
it a



amendments. At first they were either simply intended to supply omissions in the original Act, or to correct provisions that were found not to work equitably, so as to secure that tithes should be levied on lands which the wording of the original Act might seem to exempt; and there is evidently a feeling that the connexion between the clergy and the possession of tithes should be as little weakened as possible by jealously guarding provisions for commuting tithes for land. Gradually this feeling changes, commutations are encouraged, limitations are removed, exemptions are provided for lands previously made chargeable, until at last a desire seems to be evident that tithes shall be redeemed, and the old relations of the clergy to the produce of the land lessened. It may interest our readers to describe at somewhat greater length the changes thus summarized.

The Act of 1837 was intended to encourage voluntary agreements respecting the apportionment of tithes between tithe-owners and tithe-payers, and authorized the Commissioners to confirm such arrangements; it also permitted land to be given in lieu of tithe. The Act of 1838 provided facilities for the payment of tithe to be merged in the land where the land and tithe belonged to the same owner: it also removed doubts which had been raised about merging tithes in copyhold lands. The Act of 1839 provided for the security of any charge, liability, or encumbrance upon tithe which might be merged in the land under the provisions of the Acts already named, and it enabled landowners with the consent of the Commissioners to charge such encumbrance on the tithe upon a definite portion of their estate, freeing the remainder from all liability for the encumbrance. It also made it lawful for the landowners and tithe-owners 'to enter into a parochial agreement for the commutation of Easter offerings, mortuaries, or surplice fees, or of the tithes of fish or fishing, or mineral tithes.' Besides this it enabled the Commissioners to appoint a fixed rent-charge in lieu of tithes on lands exempted from such a payment, 'whilst in the occupation of the owner of such lands, by reason of having been parcel of the possessions of any privileged Order,' but liable to tithe when otherwise occupied; and it made a like provision with respect to lands belonging to the Crown which enjoyed exemption so long as they were 'occupied by Her Majesty, her tenants, farmers, or lessees, or their under-tenants.' It also made provision for tithing Lammas land, and land where there is right of commonage, and of commons enclosed for allotments; it also provided that plantations of 'apples, pears, plums,

cherries, and filberts,' should be exempt from extraordinary tithe for the first five years, and only pay half extraordinary tithe for the second five years, and that plantations of gooseberries, currants, and raspberries should have like exemptions for half that time. It removed the limit of time during which land might be given in lieu of tithe rent-charge, the first Act having given the power of making such an exchange only for the time before the final award was sealed; power was also taken for amending the award when from fraud or error a mistaken award had been given. The Act of 1840 was passed to provide against inconveniences which had arisen from doubts as to the time when the rent-charge in lieu of tithe should commence when there were unexpired agreements for the composition of tithe; it also enacted that extraordinary tithe might be levied at a fixed rate per acre in parishes or districts where other land was so charged without a separate award; and that lawns and cottages which had not previously paid tithe should be held to be exempt. The Act of 1841 took away from the Ecclesiastical Courts all jurisdiction when the value of the tithes to be recovered was less than 50*l*. The chief object of the Act of 1842 was to extend the term during which the Tithe Commissioners were to hold office; and a second term of five years was added to the five years for which they were originally appointed. But besides this it gave extended powers for substituting land for tithe rent-charge and for altering the apportionment of tithe when the land on which it is leviable has become the property of several owners. Four years then passed before another amending Tithe Act appears, and in 1846 we meet for the first time with a provision for redeeming tithe by a payment in money. It enacts that when the tithe payable in any parish does not exceed 15*l*. per annum, it may, with the consent of the tithe-owner, be redeemed by a payment of not less than twenty-four times the amount, in cases where the apportionment has not been made; and in any cases where an apportionment has been made, tithe to the amount of 1*l*. a year on any estate may be extinguished by a payment at a like rate. And it is to be noted that there is a special clause entitling the tithe-owner to claim for extraordinary tithe if the land should ever be used for a hop or fruit garden, notwithstanding such redemption. In 1847 the powers of the Tithe Commission were continued for a further period of three years. After an intervening period, when the Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission undertook the work of the Tithe Commission, the Land Commission was appointed as a permanent body, and questions of tithe were referred to it. Thirteen years then elapsed without legislation respecting

tithes ;  
which  
under  
provide  
per hea  
the Co  
parish  
had be  
tithe ;  
newly  
tithes i  
levied.  
land w  
the Co  
of the  
of any  
the tit  
plot or  
rent-cha  
provisio  
and for  
the Cop  
was pas  
tithe in  
was ave  
but a s  
serious  
legislat  
was rec  
or for a  
public  
also ga  
tithe-ov  
where i  
purchas  
both p  
provisio  
charge  
princip  
in whic  
details  
enacted  
to trou  
One  
in exch  
been gi

tithes ; but in 1860 an Act was passed to enable parishes which had local Acts fixing corn rents to bring themselves under the provisions of the general Acts affecting tithe ; it also provided for the commutation of tithe on cattle at so much per head into a fixed charge on the land ; it also empowered the Commissioners to compel the owners of tithes in any parish not exceeding 15*l.* a year of annual value, where there had been no apportionment, to accept redemption for the tithe ; and it enabled the Commissioners to declare land newly used for hop or fruit gardens liable to extraordinary tithes in districts where such tithes had not been previously levied. There was also an important provision that where land was divided for building purposes into numerous plots, the Commissioners may, if they think fit, upon the application of the owner of any one of such plots, and without the consent of any of the other owners, or of the person entitled to receive the tithe, compel the redemption of the tithe upon the whole plot or parcel of land for twenty-five times the amount of the rent-charge. In 1868 an Act was passed to alter some of the provisions in the previous Acts for the commutation of tithes, and for making provision towards defraying the expense of the Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Office. In 1873 an Act was passed to take away the power of levying extraordinary tithe in parishes not previously liable to such payments. This was avowedly done on the ground that the new tithe produced but a small income, and occasioned much friction : so that no serious opposition was made to the exemption. The next legislation was in 1878, when the Act directed that when land was required for a church, chapel, or other place of worship, or for a cemetery or school, town hall, court of assize, or other public purpose, the tithe rent-charge must be redeemed ; it also gave power to the Commissioners on the request of the tithe-owner or tithe-payer to compel the redemption of tithe where it did not exceed a pound a year at twenty-five years' purchase ; where the value exceeded that sum the consent of both parties was required. In most of the Acts there are provisions concerning the manner in which the tithe rent-charge is to be recovered, and other matters not affecting the principle on which tithes are to be levied, but only the manner in which the principle is to be applied, and the administrative details required for the equitable carrying out of what is enacted ; with these things we have not thought it desirable to trouble our readers.

One effect of these Acts has been to cause land to be given in exchange for tithes in many instances ; but no land has been given to redeem tithe after the apportionment has been

made; and tithe rent-charge to the extent of 16,510*l.* has been extinguished by payment of a capital sum of 416,460*l.* All legislation up to this time was based upon the idea that the rights of the Church were to be respected, and, though a somewhat hard bargain with her representatives might have been sometimes made, it was held that practically they had received an equitable consideration for what they had surrendered; as a different principle has been since enunciated in many quarters, we call attention to this before noticing the next Act, in which we think that less consideration for the interests of the Church was shown.

Partly owing to the depressed price for hops during several years, and partly owing to the agitation raised by the Liberation Society against tithes, a feeling was aroused amongst some of the payers of extraordinary tithes in the hop-growing counties against the payments to which they were liable. Not infrequently the tithe had to be levied by distress, and under the influence of a strong religious and political agitation a feeling was aroused against the justice of extraordinary tithe, no regard being had to the proportion which the tithe bore to the value of the produce of the land, or to the terms of the original arrangement and the conditions under which it was made, which certainly could not be regarded as unduly favourable to the Church. Under the influence of this agitation a bill was introduced by a member of Parliament who had been active in the warfare against this kind of tithe, and was passed hastily through Parliament, a dissolution being imminent, and the House of Lords having practically only a very few days to consider the bill and pass it through its several stages. But nevertheless the House of Lords so modified its provisions as to make them much more equitable to the tithe-owner than they had been originally drawn, and as they passed through the House of Commons. But, notwithstanding this, the Act certainly proceeded on a principle much less favourable to the Church than did any of the Tithe Acts by which it had been preceded, unless the exemption of newly-cultivated land from extraordinary tithe by the Act of 1873 should be considered as an exception to this statement.

It enacts that 'no extraordinary charge shall be charged or levied under the Tithe Commutation Acts on any hop ground, orchard, fruit plantation, or market garden newly cultivated as such after the passing of this Act;' that 'the Land Commissioners for England shall, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, ascertain in each parish in England and Wales, and certify the capital value of the extraordinary charge on each farm' or 'parcel of land in respect of

which  
and t  
the sa  
tion t  
exper  
the la  
be sul  
and a  
same  
taine  
land,  
the p  
any t  
empon  
part o  
exone

It  
be a l  
canno  
up fo  
sioner  
from  
tithe-  
practi  
Churc  
gagere  
in the  
the ef  
range  
made  
clerica

Th  
tion a  
believ  
questi  
to a  
the m  
stand

5,510l. has  
416,460l.  
idea that  
though a  
might have  
they had  
ad surren-  
dicated in  
sticing the  
on for the  
ing several  
the Liberal  
amongst  
p-growing  
ere liable.  
stress, and  
l agitation  
raordinary  
h the tithe  
the terms  
nder which  
as unduly  
this agita-  
ment who  
tithe, and  
tion being  
ally only a  
through its  
Lords so  
equitable  
drawn, and  
But, not-  
a principle  
the Tithe  
emption of  
the Act of  
statement.  
be charged  
n any hop  
den newly  
that 'the  
as may be  
parish in  
the extra-  
respect of

which the said charge is payable at the passing of this Act ; and that, 'for the purpose of estimating the capital value of the said charge, the Commissioners shall take into consideration the net annual value of the same' after allowing for the expenses of collection and other outgoings, the probability of the land being continued to be cultivated in such a way as to be subject to extraordinary tithe to be taken into consideration, and also the prospect of the substitution of other land in the same farm for such cultivation. When such value is ascertained, then the amount to remain as a first charge upon the land, and interest at the rate of four per cent. to be paid on it ; the person paying this charge is empowered to redeem it at any time he may see fit. The Land Commissioners are also empowered 'to exonerate from the charge the whole or any part of the land,' and to substitute other land for the land so exonerated.

It will be seen that, by this scheme, the tithe-owner must be a loser in two ways. The charge for extraordinary tithe cannot be extended, as now it can be, if new land is broken up for hop or fruit gardens ; and then, unless the Commissioners award a sum equal to twenty-five years' nett income from the extraordinary charge for the tithe extinguished, the tithe-owner will receive less than he now does. Beside this, it practically severs to a great extent the connexion of the Church with the land, as it makes her representatives mortgagees for money secured upon the land, instead of partners in the produce of the land. We have now evidence of what the effect of this new legislation is likely to be, as some arrangements have been made under this Act, and by the awards made we can test the influence which the Act will have upon clerical incomes derived from extraordinary tithe.

The parishes concerning which we have received information are in Kent. The awards have been made, but we believe that they have not been finally sealed, as some legal questions have been raised which may possibly compel resort to a court of law to decide, and until this has been done the matter will not be finally settled. But so far the awards stand thus :—

		Average payable last year : gross sum.	Annual payment, being 4 per cent. on sum awarded.
Parish A	.	£261	£174
" B	.	631	388
" C	.	1,090	642
" D	.	200	114
" E	.	4	1
" F	.	23	7

11s. 6d. 6s. 3d.

10s.

As some set-off to this serious diminution of income it must be said that the charge in lieu of the extraordinary tithe is made perpetual on the estate, whereas the land might have ceased to be cultivated as hop or fruit gardens, and so this tithe would be extinguished. Besides this the fourth clause of the Act provides that 'the rent-charge shall not be subject to any parochial, county, or other rate, charge, or assessment;' this, in some parishes, would greatly enhance the value of the payment now awarded in lieu of tithe, and it is to be expected that the cost of collection will sink to nothing when the payment has to be made by the owner instead of the occupier.

We now come to the tithe bills introduced by Lord Salisbury during the present session. Of the tithe war in Wales, which has led to their introduction, we need say nothing, for our readers are no doubt well aware of the successful efforts of the agitators to stir up strife in the principality, and so to connect the question of the payment of tithes with that of disestablishment, and in this way to throw the mantle of apparent political action over the attempts to defraud the tithe-owner of that to which he is justly entitled. The real distress at the present time in agricultural districts gives the opponents of tithe a great advantage, as there can be no doubt that in numberless cases both landowner and tenant find it most difficult to meet the demands made upon them, and therefore are disposed to lend a willing ear to any proposals—we fear we must add, in many cases, honest or otherwise—to enable them to get rid of their obligations. At the same time, it is obvious that the existing depression in prices must cause it to be very disadvantageous to the tithe-owner to effect a permanent commutation, as it can scarcely be expected that the present low prices of grain will be permanent. The rapid increase of population in some corn-growing countries and other causes may fairly be expected at no very distant date to bring about that alleviation which has been experienced on many occasions in the past, when the state of the agricultural interest seemed to be in as hopeless a position as it is at present. The bills now introduced seem to us an honest attempt to settle upon equitable terms a question that is arousing much attention and excitement in some quarters, and we cannot doubt that, under present circumstances, it would be for the benefit of the Church that they should pass into law; they would for a time diminish the incomes of many of her clergy, but, on the other hand, we think that they would conduce to peace where now there is contention and strife, to the great injury of the spiritual



interests of the parishioners and the just influence of the Church.

The first bill simply proposes to make the payment of tithe by the landlord eventually compulsory. It seeks to enact that, 'whereas by section 80 of the Tithe Rent-Charge Act, 1836, every occupier of land under any lease or agreement made subsequently to the commutation of tithe into rent-charge, who pays such rent-charge shall be entitled to deduct the amounts thereof from the rent payable by him to his landlord,' for the future this section 'shall have full effect, notwithstanding any contract to the contrary made after the passing of this Act.' It also provides that nothing in this section shall affect the rights and liabilities of any owner or occupier of any lands under any contract existing at the passing of this Act. Of course, this will in many instances delay the beneficial effect of the Act, but then the provision is only equitable, and when the liability for tithe is transferred from the occupier to the owner, as designed by this bill, it is to be hoped that there will be less irritation than there is at present.

The other bill proceeds on the assumption that the first bill has been passed into law, and it directs that its provisions shall not apply when the occupier is also the owner of the land. Its design is to substitute proceedings in the county court for the recovery of tithe rent-charge by distraint. In the first instance, the tithe-owner is to proceed in the county court in the usual way; but, if the payment is in arrear for not less than three months, and the occupier is not also the owner, then the owner of the tithe rent-charge is empowered to file an affidavit with the registrar of the county court that such rent-charge is more than three months in arrear, and that he is unable to procure payment of the same; upon which the registrar shall issue an injunction to the occupier of the land to pay what is due and to repay himself out of the next rent payable to his landlord; and if, in defiance of such injunction, he shall pay rent to his landlord without having first paid the tithe, then he shall be liable to pay the amount of such tithe as a simple contract debt. But if the occupier can satisfy the county-court judge that there were not sufficient profits arising out of the land to pay the tithe, then the bill proposes to give to such judge the power to remit, not merely a part, but the whole of the tithe. The bill also provides that tithes shall not be recoverable for more than two years after they become due, and that an injunction on a tenant to pay tithe shall not be in force for more than two

years after it is issued. It further directs that the averages on which the tithes are reckoned shall be for periods of three years instead of for seven, as the law now enjoins.

This last provision is the one which has excited the most opposition amongst those entitled to receive tithe, as its immediate effect would be seriously to diminish the amount payable. For, as the price of corn has become lower year after year, the earlier years uphold the average price on which the tithe is reckoned. Thus the average price of wheat in 1881 was 45*s.* 4*d.*, and the next year 45*s.* 1*d.*, whilst this year it will not be very much over 30*s.* In the long run, taking a series of years, the same amount would be paid if the tithe was paid on the average price for one year, or for seven years, or for twenty years; a sudden rise would be felt as rapidly as a sudden fall, and the longer the period the smaller the fluctuation in the amount to be paid. But to make the change at once from seven years to three would, under existing circumstances, inflict a considerable loss on the tithe-owner for the next two or three years, as he might possibly not live to enjoy any benefit from a future rise in prices. To diminish the present loss, in committee of the House of Lords the bill has been altered so that the first triennial period is to be reckoned from December 25, 1889, instead of December 25, 1887, as was designed by the Act as originally drawn. This will be a great alleviation, and will prevent that immediate hardship under which many of the poorer clergy must have suffered.

It has been said that a third bill is to be introduced in order to further the redemption of tithe rent-charge. We do not see what room there is for such a bill, unless it be intended to make such redemption compulsory, and to do that in the present impoverished condition of many landlords would be manifestly unjust, unless Parliament at the same time offered facilities to the landlords for obtaining the sums required to redeem the tithe rent-charge on easy terms. As we have already shown, by the Act of 1878 when land is taken for certain public purposes the tithe rent-charge must be redeemed. The Tithe Commissioners may, in all cases where they think it desirable, compel persons paying tithe of less than 1*l.* a year to redeem it at not less than twenty-five years' purchase; and where the annual payment exceeds that amount they can consent to a redemption on the joint application of tithe-owner and tithe-payer; and by the Act of 1860, where land is divided into plots for building purposes, and the owner

of one of these plots redeems the amount for which he is liable, the Commissioners can compel all the other owners of plots in the same piece or parcel of land to redeem also. What more, therefore, can be done to further the redemption of the tithe by one large payment, unless it be by offering a sufficient inducement to the tithe-payer to persuade him to redeem the tithe rent-charge on more profitable terms than is now possible? This can only be effected by either mulcting the tithe-owner, or by Government providing money for the purpose by way of loan, on such terms as will leave a profit to the land-owner who is the tithe-payer on the transaction.

If we compare the relative position of the tithe-owner and the land-owner now with what it was in 1836, we think that, notwithstanding the serious reductions of rent which have taken place during the last few years, the land-owner would be found to have the advantage. The rent of grass land near towns has certainly risen in the interval, and, owing to the great increase of population, much more land is used as garden ground; whilst the value of the tithe remains as it was fixed under the Act. And if we compare the position of the tithe-owner under the commutation with what it would be if he were still entitled to levy his tithe in kind, we should no doubt find that when the land is good he receives much less than he otherwise would have done, and when the land is bad that he may possibly be a gainer.

We are not forgetful of other considerations which to some extent must be taken into account in considering the question of tithes. There is what may be called the sentimental side as well as the judicial, and upon that side agitators have been endeavouring to work. There can be no doubt that legally and morally the clergyman has as strong a claim to the tithe as the landlord has to the rent. Both rest upon the same idea of property, and it is difficult for the one obligation to be weakened without the other being weakened also. But then there is this difference from a sentimental point of view. The tithes were given when all Christian people belonged to the same Church, and the amount was paid willingly because all shared in the spiritual benefits which the payment of the tithe secured. Now it is urged that these benefits are not universally valued or desired, and that therefore the situation is changed. We should be glad to think that only those who were opposed to the teaching of the Church advanced this plea. We fear that the desire not to pay what it is inconvenient to pay has had at least as much influence as any so-called conscientious scruple. It might be well for persons to reflect upon the possible con-

sequences of permitting a sentimental objection to bar a legal claim; but, whilst to us the case seems too plain to admit of an honest doubt, it is well for us to realize that under the inflammatory teaching of certain agitators the case will seem different to many ignorant and interested persons, and, therefore, that it is desirable to encourage the permanent settlement of the question by a redemption of the tithe wherever it is possible to do so on equitable terms. We should be glad to think that a time was coming when the Church of England would be as completely the Church of the nation as ever it was, but we dare not indulge in the illusion that we see signs of the approach of such a day. And this being the case, we do not feel that anxiety for the clergy to retain their ancient connexion with the tithes that we should do if we could entertain a more sanguine anticipation for the future. We are disposed to regard the question from a purely practical point of view, and to base our judgment on that which promises to provide the best mode of securing a permanent income for the clergy without friction or irritation, and it seems to us that this could best be effected by a redemption of tithe; but failing that, the measures of Lord Salisbury seem to us calculated to alleviate the present strained position of affairs in some parts of the country, and to prove helpful towards carrying out the more extended scheme at no distant day.

---

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*The Order of Divine Service for the Year of Our Lord 1888, according to the Calendars of the English and Scottish Churches, with Ritual Notes.* (London: J. T. Hayes, n.d.)

THERE is serious impropriety and danger in a subject like the above being treated anonymously. Responsibility is wholly overlooked by such a method. There is no doubt that a large part of this book is of a character which requires that its editors should do their work behind a screen. If their names were given and authority for their very minute directions were quoted, the lofty tone of the book could not have been maintained. Secrecy is essential to its carrying sufficient weight for its very revolutionary purpose. In most absolute terms, and without reason shown, the editors assume special authority to direct the public services of the Church of England in

the m  
'com  
Plimp  
M  
name  
which  
the sp  
the v  
-expla  
calen  
which  
Book  
which  
Chris  
for w  
follow  
adapt  
paren  
called  
T  
by su  
Sund  
the H  
additi  
tion o  
no rel  
' If S  
feast  
to the  
Scotti  
privat  
vices  
Book  
to do  
Su  
have  
hopel  
princi  
sion i  
the C  
now t  
Men  
a sys  
lure t  
and w  
If  
Chur  
of the  
appar  
this

the minutest details, while they yet simply say of themselves that 'communications should be addressed to the Editors, care of Mr. W. Plimpton, 39 Lombard Street, E.C.'

Mr. Plimpton, who is unknown to us, is the only person whose name is vouchsafed as a reference for directions and assertions which it would be easy to prove are contrary to the letter as well as the spirit of the Churches of England and Scotland, whose calendars the very inaccurate title-page of the book professes to illustrate and explain. Without reference to the discrepancy the editors publish a calendar which is not the one specified in their title-page, but one which is considerably at variance with that of the English Prayer Book. Notably, there are two holy days made prominent in it of which the Prayer Book knows nothing, viz. the Festival of Corpus Christi with an octave, on May 31, and All Souls' Day, on November 2, for which days services are vaguely prescribed, to be found and followed by those who know where to look for them and how to adapt what they find. The conscience of a nameless editor is apparently not troubled by the use of what in ordinary life would be called deception.

The editors further display their loyalty and sense of authority by such expressions as the following on Palm Sunday and the Sunday preceding it: 'Strictly but two collects should be used at the H. E. to-day, but the Prayer Book rubric seems to require the addition of the Ash Wednesday collect at all services.' 'Benediction of Palms by the celebrant' is prescribed for Palm Sunday, but no reference is made to an authorized service for it. Again, we read, 'If St. Joseph be commemorated,' &c., and, 'In places where the feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury is observed,' without any allusion to the fact that they are not in the 'calendars of the English and Scottish Churches' (see title-page). A large door for the exercise of private judgment is opened by the directions given to use 'all services special for the day' on black letter days, for which the Prayer Book provides none. Is it the Church's way to permit each man to do the best he can for himself in this manner? We think not.

Surely this book may be described, after its remarkable directions have been realized, as well calculated to make the Prayer Book a hopeless puzzle and bewilderment for the people, to encourage the principle of private judgment and dissent, and to convey the impression that anonymous editors and individual clergymen, rather than the Church, are the real religious authority. Truly the danger which now threatens the Church of England is one of a very serious nature. Men are building up a Church system by clumsy and untrue methods, a system which rests on no real authority, a patchwork which will lure the young and inexperienced from honest, loyal, truthful ways, and will alienate the nobler sort of minds altogether.

If the editors have no sense of accuracy and fitness, no sense of Church authority and of the gravity of their task, have they no sense of the ridiculous? The absence of this last sense will be abundantly apparent to anyone of a manly and reverent mind who will peruse this book. It is hard to make extracts from such a mass of

trifling matter. We are told, for instance, that 'it is usual to provide the high altar with six candlesticks,' &c. &c., and then that 'at a high celebration, when the celebrant is the bishop of the diocese, a seventh candlestick should be placed behind the cross.' Side by side with such information we are condescendingly told that 'it is strictly forbidden to use the underneath part of the altar as a cupboard or place in which things may be put.' We really thought we knew that by a natural instinct! It pleases the editors to assume the ignorance of Churchmen upon every subject, though we have not observed that they direct us to remove our hats on entering church. Again, we are told that neither chalice nor paten 'may be handled by anyone not in holy orders, except with special permission.' We had thought that the chalice was directed to be delivered into the hands of the persons communicating, which certainly implies handling. And we should have further thought that the sacred contents of the chalice and paten were of more moment than the vessels which contain them, which contents, if guarded from being touched by a layman with the care which is insisted upon for the mere vessels, would bring the practice of lay communicating to a speedy end. What the expression 'except with special permission' may mean we cannot tell. But perhaps 'special permission' for receiving the Eucharist might be obtained by a favoured few of the laity when the next step has in all consistency been taken of deciding that the Eucharist itself may not be touched by the laity.

We are furnished by the editors with other remarks on the church plate, such as that 'the whole of the inner part of the paten must be perfectly plain.' On what authority this is said we have, as usual, no information. Archæologists and many others are aware that the patens which were in use in the Middle Ages in England and on the Continent were invariably engraved on their upper or inner side. A hand in benediction, the Trinity, the Agnus Dei, the sacred monogram, &c., were very usual adornments of their upper surfaces. Many of these now remain in England and on the Continent. According to *modern* use the surface is *nowadays* in the *Roman* communion made plain, as the editors desire. But tradition and authority are the other way altogether, whatever these editors, who can only be approached through Mr. Plimpton, may say about it.

They magnify the office of the clergy in some singular ways, as, e.g., 'The corporal, the pall, and the purificator after use may not be touched by lay persons, except with special permission, nor washed in domestic vessels until they have been first washed by a clerk in holy orders, when they may be touched by laics until again used.' Here, again, we are told of 'special permission' to be had for touching them. We are puzzled therefore to know what is the exact nature of this sin of touching, and should be glad to be told on what terms such 'special permissions' are obtained. The qualifications required in a layman who desires 'special permission' to touch should be stated, as well as whether the fact of his wish is then referred to the Bishop of the diocese for a dispensation. A subject so important in the minds of the editors should be treated more fully and exhaustively.



*Sic volo, sic jubeo* requires a higher authority than the name of a Mr. Plimpton, of 39 Lombard Street.

In the multitude of details, the editors prescribe as of their own authority that 'on Palm Sunday a genuflection is to be made in the epistle at the words "at the name of Jesus."' We were under the impression that there is a comprehensive canon of the Church on the subject of reverence at our Lord's name whenever it occurs in divine service, which the editors thus limit and even ignore. We were further under the impression that such reverence is required by the canon to be made at the *Name* only, and not, as the editors require it, '*at the words* at the name of Jesus.' Men who revel in minuteness should not fail when the point is a really important one. May we suppose that because of its importance they found themselves out of their depth?

We fear greatly that such directions as this book gives, with such a supreme air of authority, will work dire confusion among the ill-trained younger clergy, who will not see how utterly such directions differ in taste and feeling from the authorized rubrics of the Church. We cannot envy the editors who have put forth such a work in such a manner.

One additional remark we make, with a serious regret that it is needed. No one can doubt that it is for the Bishops to claim authority for the voice of the Church of England as expressed in the Prayer Book. Not to do this is to abdicate. They only can do it efficiently, for it belongs to their office to do it, and they will be largely responsible if the Church of England is not warned to respect the authority of that on which her very existence depends. At a moment when lawlessness is rampant, and when it is becoming rare for any two churches to have the same service, or the same amount of service, at any given time; when favourite Manuals, with no authority, are confounding all decency and order; and when the younger clergy are becoming demoralized for want of a strong, clear, and paternal warning, the Bishops could not find a worthier subject for discussion in the Lambeth Conference. But it must be treated with a deeper sense of its gravity as a life-and-death question than, we fear, exists among them. We hope we are wrong.

The question that vitally concerns us of the Church of England at this moment is, not communion with foreign Churches or the value of the Old Catholic movement, but our own lawless and disintegrated condition. The unity of our own communion is a question of transcendental importance. And the first step to it must be made in an acknowledgment on the part of the Bishops and clergy of the absolute authority of the Prayer Book as the Church's voice. The day is at an end for diplomatic trifling.

*Ceremonial of the Altar: a Guide to Low Mass according to the Ancient Customs of the Church of England.* Compiled by a Priest. (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1888.)

WE opened this little book with a considerable amount of interest. Beyond all doubt Low Mass did exist in the Church of England

before the Reformation; but the ceremonies which distinguished Low Mass from High Mass are not spoken of in the three English Missals which have come down to our times. They seem always to contemplate a Mass with deacon and subdeacon; and the knowledge of Low Mass which can be derived from the Sarum or York Missals is extremely small. This being the case, a promise to set forth the 'ancient customs of the Church of England at Low Mass' was in the highest degree suggestive, and we looked forward to some liturgical annotations of the greatest value. We thought that a diligent liturgical student might gather from authors, either mediæval or of the Reformation period, numerous allusions to the ceremonies of Low Mass: such, for example, as may be found in the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, so admirably edited by the late Canon Simmons, and in other publications of the Early English Text Society; or in Thomas Becon's *Displaying of the Popish Masse*—a writer irreverent and profane, but who every now and then, in describing an English Low Mass, gives, translated into English, the very words of the Latin rubrics from the Mass-book of some Norman church, say of Coutances, thus in all likelihood preserving an old English rubric identical with the Norman. Then, again, as a comparative study, there still exist the early books of Normandy and France, more especially the now extinct mediæval rite of Paris and the living rite of the Dominican Friars. All these sources drawn upon by a liturgical scholar would doubtless yield materials for a restoration, more or less complete, of the English Low Mass, or at least an exceedingly useful series of suggestions towards a restoration.

The first page of the preface of this book on ceremonial encouraged us. We see that the work is intended for 'loyal sons of the Church of England;' but this feeling of satisfaction is a little damped by finding a few lines lower down that 'care has been taken not needlessly to multiply differences from the Roman rite.' On the next page, however, we find our fate, and know that we have nothing to expect, for it is announced that the minute directions have been drawn from such 'eminent [!] writers on the subject as Baldeschi and Le Vavas seur. The result aimed at has been to put the student in possession of the traditions on the method of saying Mass which the compilers of the Prayer-Book presupposed to exist.' Now this result can never be attained by such a process as the study of Baldeschi and Le Vavas seur. There is nothing in these authors which throws light upon the ancient ceremonies in England. The saying of Mass in England before the Reformation was a different thing to the saying of Mass nowadays in France or Italy. Modern Roman books can teach us nothing of the way in which our forefathers worshipped God. For a knowledge of this we must go back to what they themselves have said and described of their manner of worship.

But of contemporary records outside the printed Missals this little book has nothing to tell us. Nor does the author seem to be even aware of the amount of material waiting for analysis and comparison. The possibility does not seem to have crossed his mind.

that in mediæval England, at Low Mass, the priest may have taken his vestments from the altar and not from the vestry; that he may have prepared the bread and wine on the altar before he vested; that he may have worn the amice instead of the biretta, and worn it up to the Introit or even the *Sanctus*; and that there may have been a multitude of other mediæval variations from modern Roman custom. He gives one old English rite, but it is to be found in the Sarum, York, and Hereford Missals, and that is the custom of spreading out the arms for a few seconds in the form of a cross, directly after consecration. This ancient practice was once widely spread, but is now hard to be found in use except at Milan and among the Dominican Friars.

In the most obliging manner the author has taken over from the Roman writers the existence in the middle ages of a tabernacle on the altar (p. 84); of exposition of the Blessed Sacrament (p. 110); of the modern addition to the *Ave Maria* (p. 21). At p. 82 a number of directions are added taken from the General Rubrics of the Missal of Pope Pius V.—some even later, for the direction as to the communion of the people (on p. 103, l. 2) comes from a hint given by a Pope in the last century. The following paragraph may be given as a specimen of the literary style and of the positive assertions of the book. Low Mass for the dead is being spoken of (p. 111):—‘The colour is usually black. Red may be used, if the church have no black vestments. White for children under seven and for no others. Violet never.’ Those who have looked a little over mediæval books on ritual will know that black, violet, and blue are spoken of as substitutes for one another; and in England the wills and inventories tell us of many colours—black, purple, blue, green, and white—being used at the funerals of persons of all ages. We read of russet herse-clothes, but we do not remember red vestments.

This book is only one of a number, now, we regret to say, plentiful, such as the *Directorium Anglicanum*, *Notes on Ceremonial*, and *The Order of Divine Service* (already noticed), which attempt to put our Anglican Rite into surroundings without any authority from tradition, and which are in most cases a mere borrowing from modern Rome. The rubrics of the Prayer-Book are either violently distorted or quietly ignored to enable some modern Roman ceremony to be followed. The English prayers are encircled with prayers taken from the Roman Mass-book of to-day, often no older than Pius V. And when the prayers are older they are often a mere repetition of those that the Anglican celebrant has said, or is about to say, from the Book of Common Prayer. Further, this attempt to turn the Prayer-Book service into a mere replica of the Roman service is usually done in an unworkmanlike fashion, with small skill and little knowledge even of the Roman authorities. One is tempted to say, as in *Rob Roy* Mr. Osbaldistone does to Frank when he shows his father his bad verses, ‘Why, Sir, you don’t even understand the beggarly trade you have adopted.’

If we have spoken with severity of a book no better and no worse than its fellows that profess to teach liturgical propriety, it is because

it represents an evil which cannot be too soon abated. Every year sees a number of books come out—many of them, like this, anonymously—pretending to speak with authority on one of the most difficult of subjects, the study of liturgy, the authors of the said books being hardly acquainted with the alphabet of ceremonial, perhaps not with such well-known authorities as Baldeschi and Le Vavas seur. And when a writer, slenderly equipped with knowledge of the middle ages, promises to give us the ancient customs of the Church of England, it seems well to warn the 'loyal sons of the Church of England' of the pitfalls that are spread for them.

*The Life of John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal.* By the Rev. Sir GEORGE W. COX, Bart., M.A., Rector of Scrayingham. 2 vols. (London: Ridgway, 1888.)

WE have seldom had a more laborious or irksome duty cast upon us than the perusal of these ponderous volumes. A work of fourteen hundred pages exclusively devoted to ecclesiastical and colonial controversy recalls the pugnacious prolixity of those early Protestant and Puritan divines who set before their readers in alternate paragraphs the entire treatises they were combating with their elaborate refutation, or absorbed huge folios in the exposition of a few verses of some favourite epistle. Nor is this enormous mass relieved by the style in which Sir George Cox has treated it. In so long a journey the traveller longs for, and is entitled to, some little alternation of light and shade. Nothing is drearier than the judicial arrogance prolonged through page after page of a superior person, and Sir George Cox fills the unattractive part with a completeness we have never seen surpassed. We are not provoked by excessive hero-worship when the humility of the devotee is a conspicuous element in the devotion; but in our own days there is adoration of many a fetish whose worship consists mainly in the self-complacency of the worshipper and in lofty scorn for all who are not of the same cult. For pure narrow-mindedness under the garb of ostentatious liberality, for indiscriminate partizanship, for lavish imputation upon opponents, however eminent, dead or living, this biography is, we should suppose—we assuredly should hope it is—almost unique.

The author devotes but a brief space to the story of Bishop Colenso's early struggles, to his brilliant career at Cambridge, to the unfortunate speculation at Harrow which caused him long pecuniary anxiety, and to his parochial labours at Fornsett. He was just forty when he was consecrated to the bishopric of Natal, where he landed in January 1854. The impressions received during his first visit were forthwith given to the world in a small book entitled *Ten Weeks in Natal*—a brief period assuredly in which to have mastered a complicated problem; but Sir George avers that 'the dispassionate reader' will find the book 'one of the noblest of missionary records,' whose virtues are all the Bishop's, its mistakes are chargeable to the accounts of others. If judgment so sweeping begets inevitable distrust, it is not because we question Dr. Colenso's 'zeal, unwearied generosity, and very real charity for all men.' For a season all went

smoothly enough. Then came the questions of the 'intelligent Zulu,' the responsive doubts of the awakened Bishop, and the consequent issue of volume after volume which startled the Church both in South Africa and at home.

We are not about to reopen a painful sore. We would speak with all tenderness of one whose personal character had many claims to affection and respect. We are quite ready to allow that in the conduct of a wearisome controversy mistakes were made on both sides, and expressions uttered in the fervour of religious conviction which were regrettable. But the dignity of bearing which Sir George Cox claims for his hero does not seem to us capable of being successfully maintained. Possibly the Bishop felt too strongly to measure his words carefully. He does not appear capable of doing justice to an opponent. Bishop Gray, described by Colenso himself as 'one of the noblest, most true-hearted, and loving men that ever lived,' becomes 'contemptible,' 'dishonest,' and 'an utter humbug' as soon as he is ranged in the opposite camp. Even the long and close intimacy of full twenty years with Sir Theophilus Shepstone does not screen him from the charge of lying, put forth in its most odious form. Other examples of like revulsion of feeling and lack of sobriety in judgment might be quoted.

Yet, whatever allowance may be made for the sorely tried Bishop, no such excuse can be pleaded for the language in which Sir George Cox thinks fit to indulge. Imputations of dishonesty and untruthfulness hurled against such men as Longley, Wilberforce, and Hamilton amongst deceased prelates, and such honoured names as Harold Browne and Lord Arthur Hervey amongst the living, only recoil upon the man who uses them. Withal, not a solitary misgiving ever disturbs Sir George Cox about the infallibility of his own conclusions; neither he nor his hero can ever be wrong. It was objected that those who held Colenso's views about the passage of the Red Sea could not truthfully use the prayer in the Baptismal Office which refers to it. The Bishop replied, he felt no difficulty about it himself, but he recommended those who did to omit the passage in question. Sir George affirms that the principle had been conceded by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had said that no power should induce him to read some parts of the Burial Service over a person who had died in flagrant known sin. Sir George's logic is sublime. The principle conceded is that of *leaving something out!* In one case the words are exceptionally omitted, lest their solemn truth should under the special circumstances be desecrated; in the other the words are to be invariably left out, because their (supposed) falsehood is too painfully obtrusive. It were as reasonable to say that surgical tracheotomy is a sanction for cutting your neighbour's throat.

It is indeed difficult to estimate what doctrine could survive the application of the solvent which Dr. Colenso applied so unsparingly as at last to elicit a protest from his staunchest supporter. 'To accumulate,' said Dean Stanley, 'controversy on controversy in a community already sufficiently distracted, or to endeavour to fight out questions of abstract theology on the uncongenial field of poetical

works embodying sentiments of practical devotion, will appear to most persons in a high degree incongruous and inconvenient' (vol. ii. pp. 102, 103). We can only wonder that this sense of incongruity had not been long before experienced at the spectacle of a missionary bishop spending large sections of his time a distance from his diocese, in the publication of books which men so wide apart as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Maurice deemed utterly inconsistent with the retention of his see, and anxiously awaiting all the while the fiat of Lord Romilly to decide for him whether he might retain the emolument of a Christian bishopric. Despite the elaborate special pleading of Sir George Cox, and his plentiful aspersions of ecclesiastical bigotry on all those who differ from his conclusions, we hold that on the broad ground of 'Old Morality' Dr. Colenso was bound to resign his position when he adopted his new opinions. His invertebrate and boneless creed may be the legitimate residuum left after the application of the higher criticism, and Dr. Colenso may have honestly believed that he was bound to avow and support it; but his position was henceforth tainted with moral unsoundness which no exercise of charity will allow us to ignore.

*The Men of the Bible*: 1. *Moses: his Life and Times*, by George Rawlinson, M.A.; 2. *Solomon, &c.*, by Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.; 3. *Abraham, &c.*, by Rev. W. J. Deane; 4. *Isaiah, &c.*, by Rev. Canon S. R. Driver. 4 vols. (London: Nisbet and Co., 1888.)

THIS is an interesting series of monographs, the value of which must depend not so much on the choice of the writers as on the pains which those writers take to acquit themselves in a manner worthy of their reputation. We do not say this without an *arrière-pensée*. 1. Professor Rawlinson, for example, has in his book collected all that is known, and a great deal that can only be imagined, about the life of Moses. He has used all the materials available, and has shown considerable ingenuity in bringing in what knowledge he has of Egyptian antiquities. The education of Moses is an excuse for a survey of Egyptian arts, sciences, and religion. The silence of Scripture about his early life enables him to describe all the professions which he might have entered, but did not. The style, when he is describing events, is always clear; when he is paraphrasing the Bible narrative, singularly feeble. Take the following passage: 'There was much expressed in this short speech, Take this child away, *i.e.* take it with thee to thine own abode; do not bring it after me to my palace; let it have the nurture and treatment which it would have received naturally in the paternal mansion,' &c. Such writing is Bible adulterated with more water than workhouse broth. Professor Rawlinson informed a Commission not long ago that though his duties as a professor were *nil*, he had compensated by the publication of some five-and-twenty volumes. Some of these have gained him a creditable place in the world of learning. We hardly think that a work of this kind, which any practised book-maker might have produced, is worthy of him. We might have expected some-



thing more critical in tone which would have helped to solve the problems before us at the present day. Many will be glad that a learned Oxford professor can preserve such a conservative position; they would be still more glad if he would give his reasons for it. Criticism must not be left entirely to the destroyers. 2. Archdeacon Farrar's *Solomon* is extremely well done. The writer has spared neither pains nor learning. The notes in particular abound with evidence of this. The perplexing details of Solomon's Temple are elucidated in a way which shows how much labour Dr. Farrar must have spent in making those details clear to his own mind. And such labour is never thrown away. It finds its own reward in the unmixed pleasure given to the reader by thoroughly honest work. No one who reads the concluding chapters on the Canticles, on the Book of Ecclesiastes, and on the Book of Proverbs, can complain that the writer errs through excess of conservatism. Still, he allows, as regards the *Song of Songs*, that 'the mystical sense may be true religiously though exegetically untenable' (p. 179). Is not *repotatoria* a misprint for *res potatoria* (p. 136)? 'Feather-pated youths' and 'dementation' in another passage (p. 151) are not indeed misprints; but it would have been better if they had not been printed at all. 3. Mr. Deane's *Life and Times of Abraham* is a very readable book, and the author has not omitted to make what use he could of the Assyrian inscriptions in elucidation of his subject. It savours, however, of a compilation. Perhaps this was inevitable. In any case it is a piece of conscientious work, and will do no discredit to the series. 4. 'The Book of Isaiah exhibits to us in reality two "Men of the Bible," not one.' From these words of Professor Driver's, in his deeply interesting monograph on *Isaiah: his Life and Times, and the Writings which bear his Name* (p. 209) it will be seen that he adopts the separatist theory started by Aben Ezra in the twelfth century, and revived by Koppe, the German translator of Lowth, in the eighteenth century. The portions which he attributes to a prophet living towards the close of the Babylonian captivity, are chaps. xiii. 1—xiv. 23, xxiv.—xxxv. and xl.—lxvi. He will not even admit, with the most recent German commentator, C. J. Bredenkamp, that chaps. xl.—lxvi. 'rest upon an Isaiahic basis, which was re-edited and enlarged by a prophet living during the Exile' (p. 211). This, however, does not prevent him from saying of the 'Servant of the Lord' as projected in the future by this Isaiah II.: 'It cannot be doubted that, as Christendom from the beginning has seen, the character thus delineated by the Prophet with such genius and power was realized by Jesus of Nazareth' (p. 180). As Canon Rawlinson has observed in the Introduction to *Isaiah*—of which we assume he is the author—in the *Pulpit Commentary*, the question is one 'which may be regarded as one of literary interest rather than of theological importance,' for it is not disputed 'that the "book" existed in the form in which we have it during the time of our Lord and His Apostles' (Intro. p. xx.) In any case it would be most unseemly to import either heat or asperity into a discussion which Professor Driver, for his part, conducts with a gravity, a modesty, and

a reverence which are beyond all praise. It is on these grounds we warmly commend this monograph to the notice of our readers. They will do well at the same time to refer to Dr. Kay's able arguments in favour of the unity of authorship, in the *Speaker's Commentary*. Writers on either side of the controversy are apt, perhaps, to exaggerate the importance of the evidence to be derived from the recurrence, or non-recurrence, in Isaiah II. of words and idioms to be found in Isaiah I.

*Works of John Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln.* In eight volumes. Vol. I. *Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian.* Vol. II. *The Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria.* (London: Rivingtons, 1888.)

BISHOP KAYE of Lincoln died in 1853; he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1816. The publication, therefore, of his different writings in a collected form carries us back to a time which is even now beginning to be very remote. We have a natural feeling of curiosity when we begin to read lectures delivered in 1825, nor can we help noticing the contrast they present to modern works. They are certainly unlike what would be written or delivered as lectures at the present day; and we naturally feel inclined to ask whether it is worth while republishing books which were written before Neander's history (to take one instance) was published, and which are out of date in many of their statements.

Such a view of them is by no means altogether true. For Bishop Kaye's works possess merits of a very decided character—merits perhaps all the more valuable because they are so opposed to the tendencies of the day. He absolutely refuses to be original, or to build up hypotheses, or to make rash and comprehensive generalizations. He understands the difference between what is certain and what is probable. He refuses to come to a conclusion when there is no evidence; and where the evidence is doubtful or even balanced, he weighs all sides so carefully that his decision seems to claim respect. In order to illustrate the difference of method between Bishop Kaye and modern writers, we have compared his treatment of Clement of Alexandria with that of Dr. Bigg in his Bampton lectures. Both are good representatives of the learning and scholarship of their day, and both have a thorough knowledge of their author. Bishop Kaye, who professes solely to be collecting matter for history, absolutely eschews hypotheses; he refuses to construct from Clement a scheme of philosophy which he might have held; he asks nothing about the influences under which he was educated, and has no pleasing description of the intellectual atmosphere of Alexandria—all this Dr. Bigg gives us. The limitation of aim is undoubtedly to a certain extent a defect, but it adds much more certainty to Dr. Kaye's work. One instance will suffice. Dr. Bigg combines a very doubtful interpretation of some words of Clement of Alexandria with the late statements of Eutychius, and constructs a beautiful little theory of the overthrow of presbyterianism and the tightening of the chains of

ecclesiastical organization. All this has little foundation but the plausibility it possesses in the author's own eyes. Bishop Kaye contents himself with collecting the passages which bear on Clement's view of the ministry, and drawing the absolutely certain conclusion that he recognizes three orders of ministers. Further than this he does not attempt to go.

This one instance is sufficient to show the character of all his writings. At the present day we are infected with a somewhat German love of hypotheses. As a corrective to this, and as an instance of sober historical inquiry and well-balanced judgment, the study of these books would be useful to many of the brilliant theorizers who write on ecclesiastical history, and as specimens of hard unassuming work.

*Sketches in History and Poetry.* By the late J. C. SHAIRP, LL.D.  
Edited by J. VEITCH. (Edinburgh: Douglas, 1887.)

ABOUT six years ago the readers of this *Review*<sup>1</sup> were invited to consider the leading characteristics of 'Principal Shairp's writings,' and especially of his contributions to Christian Apologetic. It is with mournful consciousness of a serious loss that we notice the posthumous publication which bears on its title page the name of the late Professor of Poetry. His friend, the Professor of Logic and Rhetoric at Glasgow, who has brought together these 'ten papers,' describes them with tender justice as 'the last gleanings in favourite fields of one, the excellence of whose literary work will be increasingly recognized as the years flow on.'

What we have to say about the book will be confined by our narrow limits to its bearings on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. We must needs put aside much thoughtful and delicate criticism on Scottish literature of the poetical type, and on the poetry of 'Henry Vaughan, Silurist.' Possibly some English readers will smile here and there at the writer's enthusiasm for the Border ballads, which he describes as furnishing the material for a 'larger and richer' education of the whole nature than could be attained 'by reading for a first class in every one of the schools' (p. 239). But this is not our point. An English Churchman who reads Professor Shairp's account of St. Columba and of Queen Margaret, or of the ancient university of St. Andrews, will be apt to wonder that such a writer could have lived and died a Presbyterian. At any rate, it is a hopeful sign that a Presbyterian of high literary distinction should exhibit such insight and such sympathy in the treatment of the Catholic past.

The immortal story of St. Columba would put some fire into the most prosaic writer. To Shairp it was a specially congenial theme. He did not, indeed, enter into the intricate chronology of Columba's early life; its difficulties are due to the combination of the statements that he was born in 521, was ordained deacon by Finnian of Moville, afterwards studied under Finnian of Clonard (who had visited Wales), was at Glasnevin about 543, and founded the monas-

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xiv. pp. 295 ff.

tery of Derry in 546. The story of the imposed penance, which Bishop Reeves and Skene reject, is given by Shairp as 'strongly asserted from of old' (p. 11). He attributes the conversion of the Northern Picts to the fact that 'their savage but simple natures, when confronted with Columba's clear, cultivated mind, and patient, Christian spirit, felt no doubt that they were in the presence of a higher being than themselves. The man was greater, better, wiser—that was the chief point; and then the truth he brought seemed, as far as they at all apprehended it, better than their old faith,' &c. (p. 21)—an estimate of the facts which might be applicable to other scenes in the great drama of barbaric conversion. As to the 'unusual arrangement,' as Bede calls it, which subjected the bishops in the new Pictish Church to the Abbot of Hy, Professor Shairp says, 'it may be safely asserted that the first taste Iona had of Presbyterian Church polity was when the redoubtable presbytery of Argyll in one day hurled its three hundred and sixty crosses into the sea;' but he observes that while there is evidence for the recognition at Hy of the bishop's sole power to ordain, 'the bishop by no means held the place in Columba's arrangements which he holds in modern and most ancient episcopacies' (p. 32), although the Celtic independence of Rome, carried out fully by Columba, 'does not prove that he or any of his generation were free, as they could not have been free, from that taint of sacerdotalism which entered into the Church the very next age after the apostles,' &c.—a remarkable abandonment to 'sacerdotalists' of the whole field of historic Christianity. Of St. Margaret, as she is worthily named, we are truly told that 'no name of equal beauty or of deeper interest appears on the whole roll of Scotland's worthies.' In speaking of her work, Shairp takes occasion to 'dismiss the groundless belief that the Culdees were Columbite;' their history, in fact, is a curious instance of transmutation—the name of a class of anchorites being gradually transferred to men living as canons under a rule, and ultimately lapsing into such lethargy and corruption as invited the doom of salt that had lost savour. The death-scene of Margaret is described in all its pathos; but our author makes a needless difficulty: 'The original Latin' (Turgot, c. 13) 'has the 50th Psalm, but Hailes and most modern writers have in their works changed it to the 51st,' a change which the probability of the case almost seems to warrant' (p. 81). We should have thought that such a writer would know that the Vulgate reckoning of most of the Psalms makes that 'change' a matter of course. After rebuking the unreasonableness of 'disparaging Margaret because she was not a good Protestant in the eleventh century,' that is, was not 'an historical miracle or anomaly,' Professor Shairp concludes, 'She had in rare measure that faith which pierces through shadows and enters within the veil—that strong hold on the eternal world which is the only true lever for moving this one' (p. 85).

Passing over a chapter on Bishop Lamberton, who had been chancellor, not 'of the diocese,' but of the *church* of Glasgow (p. 89), and whose manifold perjuries were rather more than breaches of

'oat  
War  
on a  
as '  
had  
seld  
Ken  
hav  
Ken  
151  
'  
was  
that  
esse  
of.  
gen  
inst  
to a  
Eng  
atte  
the  
old  
can  
that  
sepe  
man  
the  
Thi  
the

the  
St.  
del  
has  
plo  
St.  
can  
cor  
wel  
hid  
(p.  
171  
is w  
tow  
lan  
as a  
of t  
for

'oaths extorted by fear' (p. 101), we must say a word about Bishops Wardlaw and Kennedy, as the founders of academic life in Scotland on a basis laid by the Priors of St. Andrews. Wardlaw is described as 'a man who, besides his general intelligence and public activity, had a turn for educating youth' (p. 144). 'Even Buchanan, who has seldom a good word to say of a bishop, is lavish in his praise of Kennedy. . . . If the righteousness and wisdom of one man could have availed to save a Church rushing headlong to destruction, Kennedy would have saved it. . . . But it might not be' (pp. 149, 151). Then as to the collegiate idea—

'No doubt the conception of life which these Catholic founders held was a cramped and confined one . . . ; but the root-conception itself, that of moulding not the intellect only, but the whole man, was in its essence deep and true beyond anything we in these modern days dream of. Even after the Reformation, the reformers still preserved for several generations the old Catholic idea of education as distinguished from mere instruction. . . . St. Andrews was, I believe, the latest of our universities to abandon the old idea that we had inherited from Catholic times. England, too, which has so much longer walked in the old way, and has attempted, by the college system in Oxford and Cambridge, to educate the whole man, has for the last twenty years been busy in casting off its old tradition. Men are eager for it, and they call it advance; but they cannot change the nature of things, and it is one of the deepest laws of that nature that the intellectual and the spiritual parts of man are inseparably combined, and cannot be sundered without injury to the whole man. The intellect itself is impoverished or dwarfed when cut off from the spirit, the fountain light of all our seeing' (p. 167).

This passage is characteristic of the disciple of Wordsworth and of the author of *Culture and Religion*.

'Cum talis eras, utinam noster fuisses.'

The late Principal of the United College of St. Andrews regrets the tasteless suppression of the 'two fine old mediæval names' of St. Salvator and St. Leonard (p. 194). He denounces the 'irrational delusion' under which 'for many generations, no bishop in Scotland has had a chance of having justice done to him' (p. 156). He deplores the 'barbarism' which destroyed the religious splendours of St. Salvator's (p. 152). He calls the Scottish Reformation a 'hurricane' and a 'whirlwind' which 'cleansed away much rottenness and corruption, but took with it also some things which no nation can well spare,' swept away many venerable things' (pp. 166, 280). The hideous desecration of St. Andrews, wrought by 'an infuriated mob' (p. 118), is treated as a 'sequel' to Knox's four days' preaching (p. 171); its results, visible in mournful ruins, are 'the record of all that is wildest in passion and darkest in fanaticism' (p. 134). The lofty tower of St. Regulus, one of the most impressive buildings in Scotland, is ascribed to the episcopate of Robert, who in 1127 erected it as a cathedral which should 'overcrow the humbler Culdee monastery of the adjacent Kirkheugh.'

We may add that Principal Shairp has a remarkable tenderness for the unhappy race of Stuart; he is thinking, indeed, of the purely

*Scottish Stuarts* when he dwells on the 'gracious, romantic, and generous character' of this royal house (p. 217); and when he says of the Stuarts in England that 'they could not become Protestant, and so refused to sell their faith for a crown,' he must refer merely to James II. and his son, for James I. and Charles I. were avowed Anglican Churchmen, Charles II. concealed his Romanism until his death-bed, and Charles Edward in 1750 professed to have abandoned the Romanism in which he had been trained. As for the faults of the dynasty, they are obvious enough—unfortunately, too obvious for palliation. The Regent Murray is succinctly described in p. 176 as 'Mary's treacherous half-brother;' and it is significantly added that 'many now believe the casket letters' to have been 'forgeries.'

The Principal, writing in *Fraser's Magazine*, could tell his Scottish readers that he 'blushed' for his own University's obsequiousness in 'inviting Cumberland, returning from the atrocities of Culloden, to become their chancellor' (p. 193). This, and not a few other sentences in the volume, would have earned the warm approval of Walter Scott.

*The Church and the Puritans, 1570-1660 (Epochs of Church History).*

By H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Tutor of Keble College, Oxford. (London: Longmans and Co., 1887.)

THIS little book is the result of thorough work, and of a genuinely historical treatment of the period. The period perhaps is a little awkwardly selected, for between the years 1570 and 1660 two very distinct epochs have place. Of the first of these, that which ends with the death of Elizabeth, Mr. Wakeman has little that is new, though much that is sensible and well put, to say. His work on the second epoch, that which may be called roughly the Laudian period, is of quite a different character. In the mere collection of facts Mr. Wakeman of course makes no claim to originality; but in the explanation of their inner spirit, of the *Zeitgeist*—at least from the Church side—we do not hesitate to say that Mr. Wakeman is superior to most historians. Often, indeed, has Laud's work been discussed, but almost invariably by partisans of one side or the other, and as generally by writers who utterly failed to place themselves mentally in the period which they professed to explain, and who wrote into the controversies of the seventeenth century the ideas of later times. Mr. Wakeman is careful to point out that the real problem of his period, one essentially religious in its nature, was 'no less than whether England, as a nation, should, or should not, cut itself off from historical Christianity, from the principles of Christianity as they had been understood for sixteen centuries.' This problem underlay all the religious action of the time, and it was often inextricably intermingled with the political action also. The question, as Mr. Wakeman rightly says, 'was decided once for all in the negative by the Laudian movement, but by that movement, not in its political, but in its religious development, by Hooker and Andrewes, and the opponents of Fisher, not by Charles I. and the President of the High Commission Court.' Perhaps the

cha  
whi  
mer  
imp  
imp  
Cal  
teen  
vini  
the  
ther  
exp  
flim  
sob  
cre  
gen  
serv  
live  
com  
of I  
Cal  
trac

And  
sinc  
Chu  
fre  
tion  
yet  
in i  
spo  
to l

in  
Jes

one  
Lau  
he  
sion  
as  
sett  
to  
its  
clea  
for

as  
fer  
nar  
the



characteristic merit of Mr. Wakeman's excellent book is the way in which the intellectual position of the two parties is made clear. A mental weakness which we meet so often in daily life is constantly imported into historical writing, and hitherto it has really seemed impossible for historians to separate the philosophical meaning of Calvinism from its expression in the lives of this or that seventeenth-century worthy. Cromwell was a good man, therefore Calvinism is an ennobling and heroic faith, has been the argument of the one side, put in its naked meaning: Cromwell was a bad man, therefore Calvinism is a soul-destroying heresy, is a very nearly exact expression of the argument on the other side. There is none of this flimsy nonsense in Mr. Wakeman's book. We can learn from him, in sober and reasonable language, what were the limits of the Calvinist creed, why it was incompatible with Catholic theology and the genuine spirit of the Anglican Church, and at the same time why it served to form so many noble natures and dominate so many earnest lives. This is well done, but better still, because put together more compactly, is Mr. Wakeman's explanation of the intellectual position of Laud and his school. The Anglican school stood apart, both from Calvinism and from Romanism, because it relied upon Scripture, upon tradition, and upon reason.

'The study of theology and the study of history had brought home to Andrewes, more vividly than to any other leader of the English Church since the Reformation, the conception of the greatness of the Catholic Church, branching out into all lands from the Apostolic College, developing freely in different ways, under different conditions, contracting imperfections, and suffering in consequence from grievous division and tyranny; yet, in spite of all, maintaining a visible unity in doctrine and discipline in its identity with the doctrine and discipline of the Apostles; still the spouse of Christ, and the pillar and ground of the truth, although subjected to Papal tyranny or infidel domination' (p. 86).

It was reserved for Laud to carry out these ideas, and to set them in permanent form, as opposed to Rome, in his controversy with the Jesuit Fisher.

But we may not linger over the book. We would point out only one more of the merits of Mr. Wakeman's work. He rightly estimates Laud's real position. Mr. Gardiner, great as are the services which he has rendered to Laud's memory in clearing him from many aspersions, has quite misrepresented him by speaking of him, with Strafford, as a reformer. Laud's aim was never to improve on the Reformation settlement, or to make an ideal Anglican Church, but simply himself to obey, and to cause others to obey, the orders which that Church, in its fixed formularies, had given. This has never been expressed more clearly than by Mr. Wakeman, and we owe him a debt of gratitude for reminding us of it.

One word about the index. It is by no means as good—that is, as useful—as it could be. We can only say that not one of the references we have looked for in it is to be found, and they comprise names as important as Selden, Pym, Burton, Bastwick, Prynne, and the Short Parliament.

*Essays, chiefly on Poetry.* By AUBREY DE VERE, LL.D. Two vols. (London : Macmillan, 1888.)

WE think that Mr. De Vere has acted very rightly in bringing together these essays from various periodicals. Both the subjects themselves and the tone of treatment are peculiarly grateful and refreshing. The old-world air of lettered ease may seem out of date to some of us, but to the true lovers of spiritual, ethical, and religious truth the volumes will be very welcome. Though nominally reprints 'in a condensed form,' we will venture to say that the contents will be new to most of our readers. The papers prefixed to Mr. Grosart's editions of Spenser and Wordsworth have hitherto been known only to a very limited circle of readers, and their wider circulation was much to be desired. The paper on 'The Characteristics of Spenser's Poetry' is supplemented by one on 'Spenser as a Philosophic Poet,' and the two give us some valuable criticism on Spenser. A very considerable portion of the two volumes is devoted to Wordsworth and the poems of Sir Henry Taylor. The articles on Shelley, Keats, and Landor hardly give any substantial contributions to poetical criticism. Then there are three papers on religious subjects, very much in Mr. De Vere's best vein. These are respectively entitled 'Subjective Difficulties in Religion,' 'A Saint,' 'The Early Christian Times.'

The last of the papers is entitled 'Recollections of Wordsworth,' and to many it will appear the gem of the collection. The appreciation of Wordsworth is steadily growing in all thoughtful minds. We believe that at the present time he is much more studied at our universities than has been the case before. He is a rival for poetical supremacy with our great living poets, Tennyson and Browning. His is a salutary and purifying influence beyond either of these, a religious influence that may be compared to Cowper's, and even to Dante's. Anything that will enable men to understand and love him better is a boon. The two papers, 'The Genius and Passion of Wordsworth,' 'The Wisdom and Truth of Wordsworth,' are striking literary estimates, and will assist us in understanding his great distinctive work as an interpreter and priest of nature. This paper of 'Recollections' is a positive contribution to the biography, one which the late Bishop Wordsworth would have delighted to have included in the *Life*. Mr. De Vere had the happiness of personally knowing Wordsworth, and he knew him well also in his mind and works. Wordsworth demanded a reverent exactness, a spiritual discernment in all descriptions of nature. He thought he had a true eye for nature, but he spoke of 'a young clergyman called Frederick Faber, who resided at Ambleside. He had not only as good an eye for nature as I have, but even a better one; and he sometimes pointed out to me on the mountains effects which, with all my great experience, I had never detected.' Mr. De Vere and his father not only knew the poet when he was at times pained and mystified in London, but among his own 'Rydalian laurels.' 'It was only among his own mountains that Wordsworth could be understood. He walked among them, not so much to admire them as to converse

with  
shad  
and  
had

“  
bard  
My  
Muc  
answ  
elev  
nobl  
after  
wort  
have  
the c  
stret  
unkn  
arou

Wor  
that  
and  
a p  
Sha

“  
grea  
had  
insta  
plac  
natu  
ther  
and  
To  
Par  
exp  
of  
hav

Rel  
Sor  
pop  
Car  
not  
tho  
of  
ma  
cul

Two vols.

bringing subjects useful and of date religiously re- contents l to Mr. their wider Charac- Spenser criticism lumes is or. The substantial apers on These ion,' 'A

Wordsworth,' apprecia- ds. We l at our poetical ng. His religious Dante's. better is Wordsworth,' literary instinctive recollect- the late l in the knowing d works. ernment eye for Faber, eye for pointed eat ex- her not ified in as only rstood. onverse

with them. They exchanged thoughts with him in sunshine or flying shadow, giving him their own and accepting his. Day and night, and in all weathers, he would face them.' His father, Sir Aubrey, had thus initiated him in his discipleship to Wordsworth :

'He taught me when a boy of eighteen years old to admire the great bard. I had been very enthusiastically praising Lord Byron's poetry. My father replied, "Wordsworth is the great poet of modern times." Much surprised, I asked, "And what may his special merits be?" The answer was, "They are very various ; as, for instance, depth, largeness, elevation, and, what is rare in modern poetry, an *entire* purity. In his noble 'Laodamia' they are chiefly majesty and pathos." A few weeks afterwards I chanced to take from the library shelves a volume of Wordsworth, and it opened on "Laodamia." Some strong, calm hand seemed to have been laid on my head, and bound me to the spot till I had come to the end. As I read, a new world, hitherto unimagined, opened itself out, stretching far away into serene infinitudes. The region was one to me unknown, but the harmony of the picture attested its reality. Above and around were indeed

"An ampler ether, a diviner air,  
And fields invested with purpureal gleams."'<sup>1</sup>

Mr. De Vere has preserved some interesting reminiscences of Wordsworth, chiefly some of his literary fragments. He considered that Coleridge was the only 'wonderful' man of genius that he knew, and says his talk was 'better than the best page of his writings, for a pen half paralysed his genius.' He has a profound remark on Shakespeare, which may be well weighed at the present day :

'Nothing can surpass the greatness of Shakespeare when he is at his greatest, but it is wrong to speak of him as if even he were perfect. He had serious defects, and not those only proceeding from carelessness. For instance, in his delineations of character he does not assign as large a place to religious sentiment as enters into the constitution of human nature under normal circumstances. If his dramas had more religion in them, they would be truer representations of man, as well as more elevated and of a more searching interest.'<sup>2</sup>

To Wordsworth himself revealed religion is 'The Lord and Mighty Paramount of Truths.' If he does not write as much as might be expected on Christian truths, the whole substratum and intention of his poetry is distinctly Christian. Mr. De Vere's *Essays* will have the good effect of sending his readers back to their Wordsworth.

Mr. De Vere has an article on 'The Subjective Difficulties in Religion,' or, as he alternately puts it, 'Does Unbelief come from Something in Religion or in the Unbeliever?' It is a kind of popular answer to a popular line of objection. He starts with Cardinal Newman's striking remark that a hundred difficulties need not produce a single doubt. He pursues a well-known line of thought, but in a way peculiar to himself, and not without touches of causticity and humour. He says that with many students and many statesmen religion has been changed into 'the religious difficulty.' He speaks of those 'who demand definitions on all occasions

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 279.

after that "stand and deliver" fashion more common among peremptory than profound thinkers.' "Agnostic" is a Greek word signifying much the same as the time-honoured one derived from the Latin, viz. "Ignoramus," and one hardly sees why this new term should be considered so great a flight of modern philosophy.' We observe that Mr. De Vere, somewhat oddly, uses 'Positism' as a synonym of 'Positivism.' It must not be supposed that his employment of irony is inconsistent with close and occasionally abstruse reasoning. He uses the following illustration of the mental attitude of many a sceptic :—

'He assumes that because religion, like nature, *has* its science, it therefore *is* science, and is nothing more. As well might he assume that nature is nothing more than natural philosophy. If he came forth to the threshold of his house he would be bathed in the sunbeams. He has another way of ascertaining whether a sun exists. He retires to the smallest and darkest chamber in his house, closes the shutter, and peers through a chink.'<sup>1</sup>

Now that the *Life* and also the *Letters* of Sir Henry Taylor are being much read, Mr. De Vere's criticisms on his poetry will have a quickened interest. We have read with much interest a paper to which we have already alluded, 'Spenser as a Philosophic Poet'—a line of criticism that most critics have been content to leave alone. We cannot help thinking that the essayist sometimes reads more into his author than he finds there. His criticism is written in a religious as well as philosophic vein. His allegorising interpretation is chiefly based on the two books *Mutabilitie*, that have been saved from the wreck and loss of the second part of the *Faery Queen*. 'In this fragment,' writes our author, 'there is a simple largeness of conception, and a stern grandeur of expression, which suggests the thought that the later half of his work would probably have surpassed the earlier in mature greatness.' The arbitration of 'great Dame Nature' will have a special interest for these days. The chapter concludes with a contrast between Spenser's philosophy and the pessimism of Lucretius. The paper entitled 'A Saint' is a review of a *Life* of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, but we must not write a review on a review, just as in the House of Commons there must not be an amendment on an amendment. The paper, 'The Human Affections in the Early Christian Times,' belongs to a period which De Mr. Vere has made thoroughly his own, and which he has illustrated very admirably in his poems.

*Myth, Ritual and Religion.* By ANDREW LANG. 2 vols. (London: Longmans and Co., 1887.)

MR. LANG has done good work as a translator of Homer and Theocritus, and has otherwise made his mark in contemporary literature. So far as we are aware, his most sustained and serious work has been devoted to the subject of mythology, and we are inclined to think that his undoubted learning and ability might have been turned to better account in some other direction. The present work is an expansion of a long article on mythology which he has contributed to

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 201.

the  
the v  
can o  
The  
of en  
searc  
The  
the :  
Mr.  
degr  
matt  
ceiv  
volu  
very  
curio  
T  
tude  
Atte  
have  
to th  
theo  
they  
Lang  
theo  
syste  
struc  
Lang  
relig  
othe  
and  
case  
phil  
ceale  
of la  
inve  
in th  
the  
with  
and  
were  
to th  
vers  
tain  
Otf  
rise  
dom  
but  
fool

of C

the current edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. He has added the words 'Ritual and Religion' without any special reason that we can discern, the work, from first to last, being limited to mythology. The subject of 'the vast vine of fable,' as Tennyson calls it, admits of encyclopædic illustration, and both text and footnotes indicate researches into the most diverse and distant departments of letters. The general impression left by the work is not quite satisfactory. In the first place it is incomplete, and we very much question whether Mr. Lang himself will think it worth his while to attempt any higher degree of completeness. He has even left unprinted a great deal of matter that has accumulated under his hands, and he plainly perceives that his work might be multiplied to an indefinite number of volumes. Much of what he has written is neither very edifying nor very instructive, but at the same time the whole work is more or less curious and interesting.

The difficulty is to import into the subject any element of certitude or reality. To make any effort to do so is like cleaving water. Attempts to throw the vast congeries of fable into philosophic forms have never really been successful. From the attempts of Plato himself to those of Mr. Herbert Spencer and Mr. Max Müller, whether the theories have been religious, poetical, etymological, or philological, they have resulted either in comparative or superlative failure. Mr. Lang sees all this, but he is not deterred from offering his own theories and explanations. He goes so far as to formulate 'a new system.' It is not exactly his own, but he has done much to construct it from the labours of previous students of the *myth*. Mr. Lang thus sums up the labours of his predecessors:—

'It has been shown that the practical need for a reconciliation between religion and morality on one side, and the stories about the gods on the other, produced the hypotheses of Theagenes and Metrodorus, of Socrates and Euemerus, of Aristotle and Plutarch. It has been shown that in each case the reconcilers argued on the basis of their own ideas and of the philosophies of their time. The early physicist thought that myth concealed a physical philosophy; the early etymologist saw in it a confusion of language; the early political speculator supposed that myth was an invention of legislators; the literary Euemerus found the secret of myths in the course of an imaginary voyage to a fabled island. Then came the moment of the Christian attacks, and Pagan philosophers, touched with Oriental pantheism, recognized in myths certain pantheistic symbols and a cryptic revelation of their own Neo-platonism. When the gods were dead and their altars fallen, then antiquaries brought their curiosity to the problem of explaining myth. Christians recognized in it a depraved version of the Jewish sacred writings, and found the ark on every mountain-top of Greece. The critical nineteenth century brought in with Otfried Müller, and Lobeck a closer analysis; and finally, in the sudden rise of comparative philology, it chanced that philologists annexed the domain of myths. Each of these systems had its own amount of truth, but each certainly failed to unravel the whole web of tradition and of foolish faith' (i. 26-7).

Mr. Lang's method of dealing with myth is based on 'the science of Comparative Mythology.' Among the founders of the historical

school of mythology he enumerates Fontenelle and even Eusebius, whom, however, he does not expressly quote. In all mythology the perplexing element is the combination of the rational and the irrational. Artemis, 'the lady Abbess of the Woods,' is a pure and poetical conception, but such conceptions are excessively sparse compared with monstrous and polluted imaginings, through a great number of which the reader of these pages has unwillingly to wade. The theory of the work is that there is 'a demonstrably actual condition of the human intellect whereof myth would be the natural and inevitable fruit.' He calls this the primeval stuff of all mythologies and all religions. He argues that the different stages through which humanity has passed in the intellectual evolution have still their living representatives among various existing races. We see in the Australian and the South Sea Islander the very same phenomena of childishness as in Greece or Egypt. Of course this gives Mr. Lang the opportunity of traversing a very diffuse field of illustration. He has read and he quotes ever so many books of travel and adventure to furnish an almost boundless induction of instances. Mr. Tylor's *Primitive Culture* is laid under heavy contribution, but indeed there is an astonishing *florilegium* of curious stories of 'totemism' and all other forms of superstition. These superstitions are ultimate facts, not to be explained away. 'We may be asked, Why do savages entertain the irrational ideas which survive in myth? One might as well ask why they eat each other, or use stones instead of metal. Their intellectual powers are not fully developed, and hasty analogy from their own unreasoned consciousness is their chief guide.' The chapters on Indo-Aryan myths, Greek myths, nature myths, have a certain degree of consecutiveness, and the same might doubtless be said of the chapters on Scandinavian myths and Babylonian myths, if he had only finished them for publication; but on the whole we find it wearisome work—like reading through the pages of a classical dictionary—in turning, in multitudinous variety, from one insane story to another. He quotes Brugsch's saying of 'the boughs and twigs of a tree of myth, whose leaves spread into a vast, impenetrable luxuriance' (ii. 117).

The work might very well form part of that 'History of Human Error' which Mr. Caxton, in Lord Lytton's story, once intended to write. It gives much information and suggests many thoughts on the general subject of idolatry. The chief but almost unavoidable fault is the great lack of continuity. There are some exceptions to this, one especially on the Greek mythology, which may be helpful to students. Though he praises the poetic forms of the Greek myth, he recalls that 'human victims were slain on the altars of Zeus till Christianity was the established religion.' Indeed a very strong argument on behalf of Christianity might be constructed from the horrible details of these volumes. Incidentally some points of much interest are discussed in these pages. Mr. Lang splits a lance with Professor Max Müller on the subject of the Vedic Hymns. Mr. Max Müller considers that in these hymns we have the opportunity of studying the genesis or birth of religion. Mr. Lang argues quite the



other way. He considers that the era of the Vedic poets was not in the least degree primitive. It is impossible to determine the dates of the hymns of the Rig-Veda, but they point back to far earlier strata of thought than is generally supposed. Mr. Lang is also severe in his criticisms on them. They are enveloped in the mists of an obscurity that was beloved for its own sake. They have their impurity and savagery. They evidence the existence of human sacrifices. Thus, through various subjects, we come to the conclusion of Mr. Lang's work, in which, like *Rasselas*, nothing is concluded. In the retrospect it seems like a kind of phantasmagoria. In the last pages, among other subjects, there are some interesting discussions on some views of Grimm and Fontenelle.

*Essays introductory to the Study of English Constitutional History.*

By Resident Members of the University of Oxford. Edited by H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Bursar and Tutor of Keble College, and ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church. (London: Rivingtons, 1887.)

In this volume six Oxford tutors have combined to make the study of the origin of the English Constitution intelligible and attractive to beginners. We infer from their preface that their pupils do not take kindly to the monumental work of the Bishop of Chester; and the tutors have accordingly done their best to put before them something easier, but at the same time based upon the great book. Mr. Freeman, as Dr. Stubbs's successor at Oxford, has recently spoken of the great educational value of Thucydides and Stubbs, and we are not altogether sure that he would approve of stepping-stones to either of his 'masters.' But what has been done for Thucydides, Mr. Wakeman and Mr. Hassall seem to think may be done for Stubbs, and if we understand their purpose aright, their ambition is to stand to the modern historian in the same relation that Professor Jowett stands to the ancient. The comparison, of course, is only possible with considerable limitations, but the Oxford tutors are careful to assert that they have no desire to supersede, but only to interpret the work on which their book is based. In the first five essays the chief periods of the development of our Constitution up to 1485 are taken in chronological order by different writers. Mr. Henson of All Souls discusses the 'Early English Constitution,' Mr. Ashley of Lincoln 'Feudalism,' Mr. Oman of All Souls the 'Anglo-Norman and Angevin Administrative System,' Mr. Medley of Keble 'Parliament,' and Mr. Hassall himself 'Constitutional Kingship.' A final essay, by Mr. Wakeman, traces the influence of the Church on the development of the State during the whole period. The essays, as might be expected, are somewhat unequal, and reveal different qualities and qualifications in the writers. Mr. Hassall and Mr. Wakeman write like practical tutors, clearly, boldly, and concisely. In Mr. Ashley and Mr. Oman the student speaks more clearly; their essays are more fresh, more vivid, more original. Mr. Medley and Mr. Henson, on the other hand, write rather as pupils than as tutors, somewhat overweighted by the subjects that have been set them. Yet on the whole we wonder at the harmony

rather than at the inequalities of the book. The uniformity of treatment and the unity of the book reflect the highest credit on the editors. The result is quite equal to the expectations expressed in the preface: a bright and generally lucid introduction to English Constitutional History has been produced.

To turn to the essays in more detail, we may take exception to some statements of Mr. Henson. We take exception to them not as expressions of his own personal opinion or conclusion—in which guise we should be able to consider them on their own merits—but because they claim, in common with the whole book, to be based on Dr. Stubbs's research. Mr. Henson, for instance, states that the Folkmoot at one time combined the characteristics of a Witenagemot and a representative assembly. Dr. Stubbs, as we read him, states the exact opposite; and we should be glad to know, as we are assured that he has read the proofs of the present essay, whether he has modified his opinion in deference to Mr. Henson's authority. Again, the *Constitutional History* nowhere implies that in Anglo-Saxon times 'the freemen were constantly on the decrease'; yet Mr. Henson states this simply, and without qualification, as a fact. He seems to speak of the process of 'commendation' as implying a loss of personal freedom. If such is indeed his meaning, it is surely a fundamental misunderstanding of old English history. Nor is Mr. Henson less misleading in his declaration that the oath of fealty to Edmund in 943 reveals a *feudal* relation between the king and his people. Mr. Ashley could have told him, as he tells us in his essay, that the personal tie was not the only bond of feudalism. The tie of land was at least equally important; and to this the oath to Edmund contains no allusion. We can scarcely accept Mr. Henson's assertion that the right to keep a *comitatus* was an exclusively royal prerogative. If such was the case, how does Mr. Henson understand Tacitus, and how was pre-Norman feudalism developed? These, and others like these, seem to be the mistakes of Mr. Henson's essay; it gives, nevertheless, a clear sketch of the progress of the royal power in the times of which it treats. Mr. Ashley's and Mr. Oman's essays are of a higher order altogether; indeed, it is difficult to see how their work could have been better done. So far as we know, Mr. Oman's grouping of all the administrative machinery of the country round the Sheriff is, as worked out, though not of course in idea, entirely original. His summing up of the constitutional position in 1215 is worth quoting:—

'Order and legality, however oppressive they had been in the government, had so impressed themselves on the nation, that even its revolt was legal and orderly. It formulates its demands as the accurate definition of already existing rights, not as the grant of fresh privileges; and all English reforms ever after have taken this same shape, as assertions of old customs, not as new departures towards ideal principles. Magna Carta aims at the practical redress of visible wrongs, not at the establishment of a limited monarchy, or any other theoretical end. This was its strength and its weakness. Its strength lay in the clear and business-like way in which the means are adapted to the end, showing that its framers knew exactly what they wanted. Its weakness is seen by the fact that it pro-

vide  
same  
the

sour  
on t  
gove  
the

Chu  
adm  
well  
of t  
and  
sam  
pre

SIN  
Ch  
St.  
mil  
the  
gen  
the  
us  
by  
of  
the  
(4  
18  
va  
m  
Br  
bo  
ac  
be  
ev  
R  
ca  
of  
ac  
re  
m

L  
o  
y

vides no permanent machinery for keeping the conduct of affairs in the same line in which they had been set, and by its neglect to guard against the recrudescence of royal tyranny in new forms' (p. 157).

Mr. Hassall's 'Constitutional Kingship, 1399-1485' is a thoroughly sound and readable essay. How the Lancastrian dynasty, founded on the most liberal theory of popular liberty, failed through 'lack of governance,' is very clearly shown, and the constitutional position at the end of the Middle Ages is plainly set forth.

Mr. Wakeman's essay is a continuous study of the relations between Church and State in England down to 1485. For such a work his admirable little history of the Church of England shows him to be well qualified, and he has given a clear and well-balanced exposition of the subject. As a whole, the book may be heartily commended, and we should be glad to see it followed by another volume on the same lines, carrying the history of the Constitution down to the present day.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS,  
PERIODICALS, ETC.

SINCE our last issue four more volumes of the reprints of Dean Church's miscellaneous writings have appeared. They are *Bacon, St. Anselm, Dante, and other Essays*, and *Spenser* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888). We should be sorry to think they completed the series; for we trust that their author may be spared to add to the gems with which he has jewelled English literature for all time. Of the 'Story of the Nations' Series four more volumes have reached us, viz. (1) *Chaldea, from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Assyria*, by Z. A. Ragozin; (2) *Assyria, from the Rise of the Empire to the Fall of Nineveh*, by the same; (3) *The Goths, from the Earliest Times to the End of the Gothic Dominion in Spain*, by Henry Bradley; (4) *Turkey*, by Stanley Lane-Poole (London: Fisher Unwin, 1888). The first two of these are of quite exceptional interest and value, founded as they are on the most recent, and some of them most startling, discoveries in the cuneiform inscriptions. Mr. Bradley's volume might be called unique, being 'the first English book expressly treating of the history of the Goths.' Each volume is accompanied by maps, illustrations, and an index. Nothing has been left undone to render the series a most valuable addition to every student's library. *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, by the Rev. H. F. Tozer (London: Longmans and Co., 1888), is certainly a case of 'spatiis inclusus iniquis'—a vain attempt to pour the contents of a quart measure into a pint pot. But 'superficial' as Mr. Tozer admits the treatment to be, this little volume is a very convenient *résumé* of a highly complicated subject, and the Preface supplies the reader with an ample list of authorities if he wishes to follow it up more in detail.

*The Story of Our Lord*, by Frances Younghusband (London: Longmans, 1888), is only valuable as a vehicle for reproducing some of those exquisite woodcuts with which Messrs. Longmans, many years ago, illustrated a very beautiful edition of the New Testament.

The letterpress is no better and no worse than in other modernized versions of the Gospels. Let us hope that the pictures will monopolize (as well they may) all the attention of the reader.

*The Life of Sir Joseph Napier, Bart., ex-Lord-Chancellor of Ireland, from his Private Correspondence: a Political Biography*, by A. C. Ewald, F.S.A. (London: Longmans, 1887), is an octavo volume of 431 pages, which may be of interest to the family and immediate friends of the deceased, but must be wearisome reading to anyone else. As an instance of the sort of 'padding' to which Mr. Ewald has resorted, we may observe that Napier was a member of the Ritual Commission, and accordingly Mr. Ewald actually quotes at length the answers given to Mr. Napier's questions by Mr. Webb, Mr. Nugee, Mr. Bennett, and others! A great part of the volume is of course taken up with Irish politics of the day, and this is a subject on which we are precluded from dilating.

*The Indian Church Quarterly Review* (Calcutta: The Oxford Mission Press, 1888) has reached its second number. The two most interesting articles are those by Canon Churton on the 'Armenian Church,' and by the Rev. J. H. Lord on 'The Book of Common Prayer in the Indian Languages.' Mr. Lord complains that the S.P.G. stands 'absolutely alone among the Prayer-Book translators of India in the endeavour to import the word "Church" bodily into the language' (p. 175). He would prefer some form of 'Ecclesia.'

*The English Historical Review*, No. 10, April (London: Longmans, 1888), continues its course with dignified adherence to the severer side of historical studies, without any attempt at 'popularity-hunting' by dealing with the interests of the day and of the hour. We honour Professor Creighton for his firmness in this particular. The *Historical Review* will thus take the place in England—and not only in England—which Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* has long held in Germany. We wish it all the success it so richly deserves. In the *Classical Review*, vol. ii. Nos. 5, 6, 7 (London: D. Nutt, 1888), we would call special attention to an article by A. S. Wilkins on a new and enlarged edition of Roberts's *Language of Palestine in Christ's Time*. In the *Archæological Review* (London: D. Nutt, 1888), of which the fifth or July number has just reached us, we find an article on *Junior-Right in Genesis*, in which the author, a Mr. Joseph Jacobs, endeavours to show that a system of succession analogous to 'Borough English' obtained among the Hebrews in the time of the Patriarchs. This article teaches us two things not generally known: (1) that Abraham was younger than Haran; (2) that Isaac was the youngest son of Abraham. A theory which is reared on such perversions of fact is not worth a moment's serious consideration. The Index of Archæological Papers at the end seems to be constructed on the most useless possible principle, viz. the names of their authors. It may be very convenient to turn to an index which shall tell us where to find a paper on an effigy in Llan-nwchllyn Church. But how will *this* index help us? It assumes that we know that the person who wrote such a paper was named M. H. B.

We gladly welcome—and we regret that we have neither time nor

space to say more than a word of welcome—two most valuable periodicals due to the initiative of Mr. W. H. James Weale. The first is a quarterly publication, called *Analecta Liturgica* (Londini, apud Thomam Weale, 1888), and contains (1) a 'Clavicula' or Key, or alphabetical index to the Roman Missal of Pius V.; (2) a supplement to the *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* of Daniel, Mone, and others, in the shape of unedited 'Proses' from the Missals of Uzès and Magdeburg. The second periodical is issued as a supplement, every six weeks, to subscribers to the *Analecta*, and under the general heading of the *Ecclesiologist* is intended to contain 'Notes and Queries on Christian Antiquities.' To both these ventures we say God speed!

*Four Addresses delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese of Salisbury, at his Primary Visitation in the Months of April and May 1888*, by John Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury (Salisbury: Brown and Co., 1888). This Charge is chiefly remarkable, amid other matters of great interest, for its very learned and exhaustive treatment of the burning questions relating to the Marriage Law. We turned, not without some misgivings, to another portion of the Charge, which deals with the Old Catholics, and were relieved to find that Bishop Wordsworth speaks with a wise hesitancy about going so far as to recognize them as 'representing the only true Church of the countries in which they live.' It was a still greater relief to see that the recognition of Swedish Orders was passed over in silence. It is not without amazement we find the Bishop advocating the disuse of Credence Tables (p. 40), and the retention of west galleries!

*The Present Work of the Anglican Communion: two Sermons preached in Canterbury Cathedral on the Sunday preceding the Meeting of the Episcopal Conference of 1888*, by the Rev. the Hon. W. H. Fremantle, Canon of Canterbury (London: Rivingtons, 1888). These sermons are just what we might expect from the name of their author, who makes it a 'reproach' to the Anglican Communion that 'during more than two hundred years . . . she has not added a single feature to her round of offices' (p. 11). We should have thought it very high testimony to the Church of England that her Prayer-Book has stood its ground for so long a period. We trust it may remain untinkered as long again. Canon Fremantle advocates the use of 'extempore prayer at suitable services,' the 'little insisting' on the Athanasian Creed, the preference to secular courts over 'clerical tribunals,' and the 'recognition' and 'episcopal superintendence' of Old Catholics and *similar bodies in Spain and Mexico* (!) All this, we repeat, is only what we might expect from Canon Fremantle. Such an expression as 'the taint of clericalism' seems like an echo of Gambetta's mot—'Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!'

*An Address delivered at a Special Service held in Westminster Abbey on June 18, the day of the Funeral of Frederick III., late Emperor of Germany*, by G. G. Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster (London: Rivingtons, 1888). That man must indeed have a heart of flint or a head of lead who could not be moved to worthy

words by the pathetic event of the late German Emperor's death. No worthier words could well have been found than those which fell from the lips and flowed from the heart of Dean Bradley on Waterloo day. It is a little curious that neither he nor the Rev. Robert Eyton in a similar publication, *Life and Death: a Sermon preached in Holy Trinity, Upper Chelsea, on the Third Sunday after Trinity, June 17, 1888, being the Sunday after the death of the Emperor of Germany* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1888), should either of them have thought of putting on record, in their respective pages, the day on which the Emperor died, viz. June 15. The theme of Mr. Eyton's fine sermon is, success amid seeming failure.

We have received the first number of *Men and Women of the Day: a Picture Gallery of Contemporary Portraiture* (London: Richard Bentley and Son, fol. 1888). Within the cover we find three of Barraud's splendid photographs, viz. (1) The Marquis of Hartington, (2) Miss Mary Anderson, and (3) Cardinal Newman, accompanied by biographical letterpress. It is a most interesting publication, which we trust will be supported. Those who care to do so can frame the photographs. Who would not be glad to refresh his spirit by having such a fine portrait of John Henry Newman on his walls? In the list of portraits promised we miss the name of the Dean of St. Paul's.

*Apropos* of 'Men of the Day' we trust Mr. H. H. Gibbs may see his way to reprint and publish in *book* form his able and interesting memoir of the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, a 'short copy' of which, extracted from the fourth volume of the *Transactions (N.S.) of the Royal Institute of British Architects* (before whom this memoir was read), is now before us. We are sure there are many who would be glad to possess in a more permanent form this excellent record of one whose name must be dear to the heart of every English Churchman.

---



# INDEX TO VOL. XXVI.

## AME

AMERICA, the Philosophy of (Dr. M'Cosh's *Realistic Philosophy Defended in a Philosophic Series*, reviewed), 124 *sqq.*; the author's notions of Realism, 124; surprising errors—printer's and others, 125; defects of style, 126; an array of assumed truths, 127; the criteria of truth, 128; Dr. M'Cosh's application of the Methods of Induction, 129; the idea of Cause, 129 *sq.*; his criticisms on Evolution, 131; treatment of the questions of Providence, Certitude, and Prayer, *ib.*; his rebuke of the critical method, 132; the difference of view in Greek and in modern philosophical speculations, 133; the subjective method has a real affinity with the inductive, 134; deficiencies in Dr. M'Cosh's work, 135; Self-Evidence and Necessity as criteria of Truth, 136; the author's failure to invalidate the method of Idealism, 136 *sq.*

Angevin Kings of England, the (review of Miss Norgate's work), 171 *sqq.*; influence of Mr. J. R. Green, 171; limits of Miss Norgate's volume, 172; excellence of her work, 173; a few errors noted, 174; history of foreign states that have influenced our history, 175; sketches of Stephen of Blois, Henry II., 175 *sq.*; Henry's uniform policy for each part of his dominions, 176; his administrative experiments first tested in Normandy, 177; his ecclesiastical policy, 178; treatment

## CHR

of heretics, *ib.*; growth of the English Church under the Angevin kings, 179; account of Henry of Winchester, 180; Archbishop Theobald, John of Salisbury, Niggellus, 181; Thomas Becket, 182; ecclesiastical reformation a general aim among the great churchmen of the period, 184

*Archæological Review, The*, 253, 506

BALL, Rev. C. R., *The Dispensation of the Spirit*, 236

CEREMONIAL of the Altar: a *Guide to Low Mass*, &c., compiled by a Priest, 485

Christian Doctrine, a Manual of (review of Canon Mason's *The Faith of the Gospel*), 137 *sqq.*; the need of such a work, 137; the presentation of Christianity as it is, apart from discussions as to the authority to teach it, 138; claims of the human intellect and conscience to judge in matters of belief, 139; general estimate of Canon Mason's book, 140; relation of Dogmatic Theology to Apologetics, 141; presentation of the Christian faith on its own merits, 142; nature of the authority of Scripture, 143; the nature of angels, 143 *sq.*; the Being and Nature of God, 145; Evolution and Christian teleology, 146; man is a dual being, 147; the Incarnation and the saving work

## CHU

- of Christ, 148; affinity of the Word for Incarnation, 149; the blessings brought to us by Christ's Incarnation and Death, 150; the theory of faith in Christ must be simple, 151; the Holy Eucharist, 152; excellent presentation of religion given by Canon Mason's book, 153
- Church Dictionaries, 326 *sqq.*; the new edition of the late Dean Hook's, 327; weak points therein, 328; inaccuracies, 329; treatment of the Communion Office, 330; of the 'North side,' 331; Lord Grimthorpe's articles: on Disestablishment, 332; on Patronage, 333; on Miracles and Rationalism, 334; Mr. Benham's *Dictionary of Religion*, 335; inaccuracies, 336; treatment of polemical questions, 337; the S.P.C.K. *Dictionary of the Church of England*, 338; excellencies and weak points, *ib.*; treatment of the Ornaments Rubric, 339; on Dissenting Communities, 340
- Church organization, ancient and modern, 295 *sqq.*; notice of Dr. Hatch's *Growth of Church Institutions*, 295; a search for differences, 296; two concessions, 297; the general identity of present diocesan organization with that of the period of the four great Councils, 298; the bishop was unique in his own sphere, which was diocesan, not congregational, 300; the grouping of dioceses into provinces, 300 *sq.*; of provinces into exarchates, 301; exarchates organized into patriarchates, 302; Dr. Hatch's arguments from the Councils of Ancyra and Nicæa, 303; the cases of Cyprus and Armenia as 'autocephalic,' 304; 'National Churches,' 305; the ecclesiastical organization was modelled on the civil, 306 *sq.*; demonstration from the canons of Chalcedon, 308; the *Synecdemus* of Hierocles, 309; Dr. Hatch's counter-theories, 310 *sq.*;

## COR

- the case of Cornelius and Novatian at Rome, 312 *sq.*; Epiphanius's account of Meletius and Peter of Alexandria, 314 *sq.*; Hippolytus and Callistus, 316; the argument from the large number of bishops in Proconsular Asia, 317; North Africa, 318; village bishops, 319; chorepiscopi, 320; evidence that they were a local institution, 320 *sq.*; reasons for their number in Cappadocia and paucity elsewhere, 321; early evidence of the association of the bishops of a definite area, 322; synods, 323; metropolitans, *ib.*; evidence of the general dependence of Churches upon one another, 324; deduction from the pre-eminence of the sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, 325
- Church, Prof. A., *Carthage, or the Empire of Africa*, 248
- Classical Review*, the, Nos. I.-V., 252, 506
- Colvin, Prof. S., *Keats*, 250
- Corinthians, the First Epistle to, 154 *sqq.*; special points of interest in the Epistle, 154; certainty of authorship, *ib.*; the place where and time when it was written, 155; the circumstances which led to its being written, *ib.*; its historical and evidential value: from its nearness to the lifetime of Christ, 156; from its evidence as to the author himself and his fellow-labourers, 157; from its information as to the faith and customs of the Church, 158; from its statements about Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, 159 *sq.*; Dr. Kay's Commentary on the Epistle, 161; Bishop Ellicott's, 162; Dr. Godet's, 163; their various treatment of the Greek text, 164; specimens of their respective exegesis, 165; on the angels (vi. 3, xi. 10), 165 *sq.*; 'Wast thou called, being a bond-servant,' &c. (vii. 21), 166; 'baptized for the dead' (xv. 29), 167; 'This is my body,' &c. (xi. 24),

## COX

- 168; the meanings of *ποιεῖν* and *ἀναμνησθεῖν* (*ib.*), 169 *sq.*  
 Cox, Rev. Sir G. W., *The Life of J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal*, 488  
 Creighton's *History of the Papacy* (vols. iii. and iv.), reviewed, 388 *sqq.*; style of the work, 388; the place of the papacy in the new political system, 389; the attempts to put constitutional restraints on Paul II., 390; influence of the religious aspect of the Renaissance on the papacy, 391 *sq.*; the secular policy of Sixtus IV., 393; his nepotism, *ib.*; Cardinal Riario's profligacy, 394; the double murder of Lorenzo and Giuliano de' Medici, 395; anarchy in Innocent VIII.'s reign, 396; the story of Djem, son of Mahomet II., 397; Alexander VI., 398; Mr. Creighton's estimate of his character, 399; Julius II. (Rovere), 400; the League of Cambrai, and the excommunication of Venice, 401; the soldier-pontiff, 402; secular policy of Leo X., 403; his political intrigues, 404; startling contrasts of the Renaissance period, 405; results of Papal policy in Italy and other states, 405 *sq.*

**DARWIN, Charles**, *The Life and Letters of*, reviewed, 31 *sqq.*; the value of such biographies, 32; Darwin's eminent fitness for founding the school of Evolution, 33; his modest opinion of his own powers, 34; his domestic life, 35; Prof. Huxley's statement of the relations of Teleology and Evolution, 36; estimate of the 'mechanical theory of the universe,' 37 *sq.*; science unable to refute the teleologist, 39; the understanding is not the sole organ of truth, 40; the work of the feelings, affections, instincts, reason, 40 *sq.*; science and teleology are not really enemies, 42; the unknown originating Power of the Evolu-

## FRA

- tionist, 43; Darwin's habitual use of the name of God, 44; his hesitating declarations of unbelief, *ib.*; his circumscribed spiritual wants and faculties, 45; what is the limit of man's mental development? 46; stunted faculties, 47  
 De Vere, Mr. A., *Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire*, 237; *Essays*, 498  
*Dublin Review*, *The*, 255

**ENGLISH Historical Review**, *The*, 253, 506  
 Ewald, Mr. A. C., *The Life of Sir Joseph Napier, Bart., ex-Lord-Chancellor of Ireland*, 506

**FRANCIS** of Assisi and the Renaissance, 340 *sqq.*; recent works on the Saint's history, 341; Dr. Thode's work on Francis's influence on Renaissance Art, *ib.*; Dr. Thode's researches, 342; materials for the Saint's Life, 343; rectification of dates, 344; description of Alvernia, 345; the 'Stigmata,' 346; the Saint's enthusiasm of love, 347; the two great truths proclaimed in his preaching, 348; rise of the new Christian pictorial art, *ib.*; early portraits of Francis, 349; the frescoes in the Upper and the Lower Church at Assisi, 350; Giotto's cycle of frescoes, 351; description of Assisi, 352; account of the great double church, 353; Fra Filippo di Campello, *ib.*; the architecture, 354; the stained glass, 355; the artists who decorated the churches, *ib.*; Giotto's work there, 356; Gothic forms exclusively used in Franciscan churches in Italy, 357; the Franciscan churches of North Italy, 358; Franciscan philosophers and theologians, 359; poets: Jacopone da Todi, *ib.*; musicians: Thomas of Celano, 360; Fra Vita of Lucca,

## FUT

- 361; influence of Franciscan preaching, poetry, and music upon painting, *ib.*; Giotto's allegorical representations at Assisi, 362
- Future Retribution, 363 *sqq.*; notice of the Bishop of Exeter's Charge (1887), and of *Future Probation, a Symposium*, 363; of Dr. Shedd's *Doctrine of Endless Punishment*, and Mr. Row's *Future Retribution*, 364; difficulties which beset the doctrine of the Last Things, *ib.*; aggravated by the form of popular religion in England, 365; the tendency to whittle away truths, 366; the doctrine of the Fall, 367; the conception we are to form of the Fall, 368; the Reformers' conception of original sin, 369; results of this teaching, 370; the position of those who have not been able to receive the Gospel message, 371 *sq.*; statement of the Church's view of the Fall, 373; how this meets difficulties: from the non-universality of Christianity, 374; from the position of the outcast population of large towns, 375; the question of an intermediate state: the passing of the Jewish Sheol into the Christian Church, 376; difficulties arising from the Reformers' rejection of Purgatory, 377; the true conception of the intermediate state, 378; teaching of the Apostles and of St. Irenæus, 379; the parable of Dives and Lazarus, 380; the Church behind the veil is a working Church, 381 *sq.*; estimate of the doctrine of Future Probation, 383; the Day of Judgment: our Lord's teaching, 384; the punishment of the wicked, 385; the fire of Hell, 386; the irrevocable nature of the doom of the wicked, 387

GAUTIER, M. L., *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge: Les Tropes*, 241

## HUM

- HARNACK'S History of Church Doctrine, reviewed, 447 *sqq.*; merits and defects of German criticism, 447; Professor Harnack's contributions to theological literature, 448; examples of his critical methods, 449 *sq.*; his opinion of the origin of Catholicism, 450; of the institution of Baptism, 451; of the 'Development of the Church Dogma,' 452 *sqq.*; the materials out of which the Christian faith was developed, 453; the form and the matter of the Christian religion, 454; Professor Harnack fails in what he has undertaken, 455; historical value of the doctrinal struggles of the Eastern Church, 456; the work of the Christian philosophy of Alexandria, 457; the early contest against Rationalism, 458; the work of Shnoodi the Copt, 459 *sq.*; the reaction against extreme mysticism and asceticism, 461; rise of systematic theology, 462; influence of the Byzantine court on theology, 462 *sq.*; position and action of the see of Rome, 464; the human element in Christian dogmas, 465; Cardinal Newman's opinion on the need of distinctive formularies, 466; in what sense Christian doctrines are simple, 467; the Incarnation is the doctrine that has the strongest hold on all schools and classes, 468
- Hettinger, Dr. F., *Dante's Divina Commedia: its Scope and Value* (ed. H. S. Bowen), 230
- Human body, the, in the economy of grace, 1 *sqq.*; the controversy between Catholics and Evangelicals, 1; the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, 3; the communication of the Divine Corporeity of the Saviour, 4; the charter of man's original creation, 5; correlation of the fall and the redemption, 6; the two worlds of spirit and matter in man, 7; the punishment of the fall, 8; the covenant with the

## IND

patriarchs implied the promise of the resurrection of the body, 9 *sq.*; St. Paul's development (Rom. viii.) of our Lord's teaching on this point, 11; the resurrection the culminating glory of the redemption, 12; how the Incarnation 'summed up all things', 13; contrast of the treatment of the resurrection by the Apostles and by modern Evangelicals, 14; Christ's rising again is the undoing of the penalty of Adam, 15; the Ascension, 16; the doctrine of the Sacraments as 'effectual signs', 17; analogy of the doctrine of original sin and that of baptismal regeneration, 18; the Presence in the Eucharist, 19 *sq.*; the true and the false teaching thereon, 21; it is the Presence of Christ's glorified Humanity, 22; the teaching of John vi., 23; the exposition of 'If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body', 24 *sqq.*; application to the words of institution of the Eucharist, 27 *sq.*; the Body of the Resurrection both 'spiritual' and 'real', 29; *résumé*, 30 *sq.*

*INDIAN Church Quarterly Review, The*, 253, 506

**J**EWES, the conversion of the, 185 *sqq.*; a standing evidence of the truth of Christianity, 185; various vain efforts to explain the unique position of the Jews, 186; an adequate history of the race desiderated, 187; the Church and the Jews, 188; the Jews in England: *temp.* William I., 189; William II., 190; treatment of Jewish converts at this period, 191; the 'Domus Conversorum', *ib.*; connexion of the Jews with Oxford, 191 *sq.*; their expulsion from England (A.D. 1290), 193; their return in the time of Oliver Cromwell, *ib.*; dislike felt for them by distinguished men, 194; schemes for their conversion, *ib.*; the story of Lewis Way, 195; VOL. XXVII.—NO. LII.

## MEN

the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, 195 *sq.*; Joseph Wolff, Henry Stern, 196; Mr. M. Rosenthal, 197; details of his work at St. Paul's, Haggerston, 198 *sq.*; treatment of converts, 200; great poverty of the Jews, *ib.*; the Parochial Mission to the Jews, 201; lack of efforts in foreign lands, 202; statistics of converts, 203; excellence of the work, 203 *sq.*

*KAYE, Bishop, Works of*, 492

**L**ANG, Mr. A., *Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, 500

Liberationist fallacies, 68 *sqq.*; the honourable and the misleading classes of the Society's publications, 69; its origin and its influence, 70; its contradictory statements about the revenues of the clergy, 71; its appeals to ignorant electors, 72; its opposite method with the intelligent, 73; discussion of the two main sources of Church revenues: Lands, 74; various Liberationist statements criticized, 75 *sqq.*; garbled quotations, 77 *sq.*; Tithes: Ethelwulf's so-called donation, 79; the argument from the Barren Lands Act, 80 *sq.*; the real purport of that Act, 82; the argument that 'the clergy have filched the tithes from the poor', 83 *sq.*; criticism of various estimates of the cost of the Established Church: Mr. Martin's, 85 *sq.*; that given in Liberationist pamphlets, 86 *sq.*; Mr. A. Arnold's, 88 *sq.*; comparison of the three, 90; Liberationist statements about the relations of the clergy towards their parishioners, 91 *sqq.*; characteristic features of Liberationist methods, 93 *sq.*

**MAHAFFY, Prof., Alexander's Empire, 248**

Maine de Biran; *Science et psychologie* (ed. A. Bertrand), 244  
*Men of the Bible, The*, 490

L L

## MES

Messiah in the Old Testament, the, 95 *sqq.*; use of Prophecy in Christian apologetics, 95; no serious difficulty as to the date of Messianic predictions, 96; the problem now is as to their extent and nature, 97; estimate of Mr. Stanton's *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah* and Dr. Briggs's *Messianic Prophecy*, 97 *sq.*; Mr. Stanton's use of Apocalyptic writings, 99; his method criticized, 100 *sq.*; tendency to minimize the evidential value of Messianic prophecy, 102; the genesis and growth of the Jewish conception of the Messiah, 103; did the prophets understand the full meaning of their predictions? 104; Mr. Stanton's and Dr. Briggs's views on the beginning of the Messianic Hope, 105; the chain of predictions from the Protevangelium to Nathan's promise to David, 106; Mr. Stanton's hesitating statements, 107 *sq.*; the prophets' conception of the Messiah as King, 109; the imagery of the *Sibylline Oracles*, and of the *Psalms of Solomon*, 110; the 'Servant of Jehovah' in Isaiah, 111 *sqq.*; conception of the Messiah as Prophet, 114; as Priest, 115; transformation of the Jewish into the Christian idea of the Messiah, 116; plan and character of Dr. Briggs's work, 117; his dismemberment of the Book of Isaiah, 118; attempt to combine the Higher Criticism with old-fashioned orthodoxy, 119; criticism of his violent handling of parts of the Scriptures, 120 *sq.*; his firm maintenance of the Godhead of the Christ, 122; comparative estimate of Mr. Stanton's and Dr. Briggs's works, 122 *sq.*

NATIONAL Gallery, the, 48 *sqq.*; the edifice, 48; discriminating selection of its contents, 49; signs of increasing interest in it, 50; its origin compared with those of foreign collections,

## NOV

*ib.*; acquisitions, presents and bequests from 1824 to 1838, 51; blunders of the early board of trustees, 52; Sir C. Eastlake's services as Director, 33; Sir W. Boxall, *ib.*; additions made by Sir F. Burton, 54; Leonardo's 'Virgin of the Rocks,' 55; the *Ansdei Madonna*, 56; the recent classification of the pictures, *ib.*; the additional rooms opened last year, 57; Margaritone, Cimabue, Giotto, 58; Fra Angelico, Paolo Uccelli, Piero di Cosimo, Pollajuoli, 59; Sandro Botticelli, Michael Angelo, Francia, 60; Raphael and Umbrian art, 61; Titian, G. Bellini, P. Bordone, P. Veronese, Tintoretto, Mantegna, 62; Rubens, Vandyck, Rembrandt, 63; paucity of German pictures, 64; the French school, *ib.*; Spanish, Bolognese and Roman schools, 65; British pictures, 65 *sq.*; comparatively small cost of the collection, 66; benefits arising from such a gallery of art, 57

New Books, New Editions, etc., Brief Notes of, 252, 505

Newell, E. J., *A Popular History of the Ancient British Church*, 251

*Nibelungen Lied*, *The*, trans. A. G. Foster-Barham, 240

Novels (*Caswell*; *The New Antigone*; *Robert Elsmere*) reviewed, 423 *sqq.*; the treatment of religious questions through the medium of fiction, 423; a special difficulty in religious novels, 424; the treatment of sin and shame in *Caswell* and *The New Antigone*, *ib.*; outline of *Caswell*, 425; vivid sketches of character, 426; the purpose of the story, 427; *Caswell's* conversion, 428; blemishes, 429; excellencies, 430.—General estimate of *The New Antigone*, 431; overdrawn description, 432; the handling of the passion of love, 433; pandering to a pernicious stimulus, 434; internal evidence of the author's religious faith, 435; the crisis of



## ORD

the plot, 436; a welcome example of healthy treatment of sin, 437.—Why *Robert Elsmere* has gained its celebrity, *ib.*; why it is a dangerous book, 438; weakness of its attack on Christianity, 439; its force consists only in its subtlety, 440; the matter of the story, 441; the manner: the negation of Christ's Divinity, 442; denial of miracles, 442 *sq.*; fallacies: on the Atonement and the Resurrection, 444; unintentional service to Christianity, 445; thought suggested by the combination and contrast of the three novels reviewed, *ib.*; indulgent treatment of such a work as *Robert Elsmere* deprecated, 446

*ORDER of Divine Service for 1888 . . . with Ritual Notes* (Anonymous), 482

**P**ESSIMISM and Scientific Meliorism, 205 *sqq.*; alarming growth of modern Pessimism, 205; suggested change of name to Malism, and from Optimism to Meliorism, 206; sketch of Schopenhauer's system, 206 *sq.*; the pessimism of Hartmann, 208; his desire to supplant Christianity, 209; how pessimism may prove to be an auxiliary to religion, 210; the Christian *contemptus mundi* not analogous to pessimism, 211; the pessimist's arguments: from the balance of evil over good, 212; from the superior value of the ethics of pain, 213; from the history of social evolution, 214; here pessimism and scientific meliorism are brought face to face, *ib.*; pessimist philosophy is lop-sided: ignores any method of evolving good out of evil, 215; the question which the social reformer endeavours to answer, 216; the order of evolution of scientific

## RIL

meliorism, 217; the weak points of both hypotheses, 217; collective happiness means the happiness of individuals in the aggregate, *ib.*; distorted views of life and duty, 218; ways in which pessimism may be an ally of religion, 219; importance of the discipline of pain, *ib.*; contrast of Christian and pessimistic self-mortification, 220; sympathy and pity for suffering, 221; Schopenhauer's and Hartmann's Pessimism, Scientific Meliorism, and the Religion of Humanity have all left no room for a Deity, 222  
*Philosophy of Church Life*, Tudor's, reviewed, 407 *sqq.*; two forms of apologetic works: the logical, 407; the appeal to the human heart, 408; Mr. Tudor's aim purely personal, 409; his style: mystifying phraseology, 410; lack of material for his work, 411; bad arguments and ill-expressed, 412; good points of the book, 413; the author's method, *ib.*; treatment of disbelievers in miracle, 414; argument from history examined on the assumption that the Christian revelation is true, 415; Mr. Tudor on the 'divine self-manifestation,' 416; on the relation of revelation to human knowledge, *ib.*; on the true value of a scientific philosophy, 417; how does Christianity satisfy the spiritual and the moral needs of man? 418; Mr. Tudor's tendency towards mysticism, 419; the limits of mysticism, 420; the connexion between the Christian revelation and morality, 421 *sq.*; a thorough restatement and redefinition of the fundamental truths of Christianity desiderated, 422 *sq.*

*REVUE des Etudes Juives* (No. 29), 246  
*Revue de théologie pratique et d'homilétique* (Oct. 1887), 245  
Riley, Mr. A., *Athos, or the Mount of the Monks*, 222

## SAD

SADLER, Rev. M. F., *The Epistle to the Romans, with Notes Critical and Practical*, 235

Schaff, Dr. P., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vols. iv. and v., 228

Shairp, Principal, *Sketches in History and Poetry*, 493

Syriac New Testament, the printed editions of the, 257 *sqq.*; importance of the work, 257; one English edition before this century, 258; issues by the Bible Society and by Mr. Bagster, *ib.*; description of the New York edition published in 1886, 259; materials that are available in England for a critical edition, 260; the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam's Essay on the subject, 261; history of the *Editio Princeps*, 262; Teseo Ambrogio, 262; Widmanstadt, 263; the earliest specimens of Syriac printed from movable metal types, 264; Ambrogio's Chaldaic &c. Grammar, 264 *n.*; progress of Widmanstadt (or Lucretius), 265 *sqq.*; Moses of Mardin, 269; Guillaume Postel, 270; the preparation of the Syriac type, 271; the *Editio Princeps* printed, 272; question as to the MS. used, 272 *sq.*; other Syriac works of Widmanstadt, 274; Moses of Mardin's share in the work, 275; his character and motives, 276 *sq.*; his treatment by Popes Paul and Julius, 278; relations of Jacobite patriarchs with Rome in the thirteenth century, 279 *sqq.*; the patriarchs in the sixteenth century, 281; circulation of the *Editio Princeps*, 282; further editions, 283; the Peshitto in the Paris Polyglot (1633), 284; Walton's Polyglot, 285; estimate of

## WIC

the value of the Peshitto Version: by Widmanstadt, 285 *sq.*; by Ussher, 287; by Walton, 288; decline and revival of interest in it, 288 *sq.*; estimate of its critical use, 290; the claim that the Curetonian text is the *Syriaca Vetus*, 291 *sq.*; the *Antilegomena*, 293; suggestions for the projected Clarendon Press edition, 294 *sq.*

TALMUD de Jérusalem, Le, trad. par M. Schwab, vol. x., 246

Temple, Sir R. *Cosmopolitan Essays*, 233

Tithe legislation, 469 *sqq.*; tithes used generally to be levied in kind, 469; the old modus or money payment, 470; the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836, 471; its provisions, 472; amendment Acts of 1837-8-9, 473; the Acts of 1841-2-6-7, 474; the Acts of 1860-68-73, 475; the agitation against extraordinary tithes, 476; provisions of the Act thereon, 476 *sq.*; the Commissioners' award in Kent parishes, 477; the two bills recently introduced by Lord Salisbury, 478; consideration of their provisions, 479; the question of the redemption of tithes, 480; relative position of the tithe-owner and the landowner now and in 1836, 481; the sentimental side of the agitation against tithes, 481 *sq.*

WAKEMAN, H. O., *The Church and the Puritans*, 496; *Essays introductory to English Constitutional History*, 503  
*Wiclif: an Historical Drama*, 250

PRINTED BY

SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE

LONDON

6

Version:  
sg.; by  
on, 288;  
interest in  
its critical  
that the  
*Syriaca*  
*legomena*,  
projected  
n, 294 sg.

lem, *Le*,  
b, vol. x.,

*Titian Es-*

.; tithes  
levied in  
modus or  
the Tithe  
336, 471;  
endment  
the Acts  
e Acts of  
agitation  
ches, 476;  
thereon,  
issioners'  
477; the  
duced by  
considera-  
479; the  
ption of  
osition of  
the land-  
481; the  
agitation

*the Church*  
6; *Essays*  
*Constitu-*

*rama*, 250